3 0510 00172 7413

Augsburg College
George Sverdrup Library
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404



ECONOMIC DETERMINISM

OR

THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY

BY

LIDA PARCE

CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1913

GEORGE SVERDRUP LIBRARY

Copyright, 1913
By Charles H. Kerr & Company

JOHN F. HIGGINS
PRINTER AND BINDER
80
376-382 MONROE STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGSBURG COLLEGE
GEORGE SVERDRUP
LIBRARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

HC
25
P3

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

"Economic Determinism" is one of four phrases which are used interchangeably by modern writers in referring to a sociological law which is the joint discovery of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels and was first given to the world in the year 1848. The other phrases used for the same idea are "The Materialistic Conception of History," "Historical Materialism," and "The Economic Interpretation of History." The classic statement of the principle in the words of Frederick Engels is as follows:

"That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class struggles."

The phrase usually employed by the author of the present work is "The Economic Interpretation of History," but as this exact phrase has been used as the title of a work by Professor Seligman, we have, with the author's consent, used the shorter title for this book.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Introduction	9
II	The Period of Savagery	16
III	The Period of Barbarism	23
IV	Early Civilization	38
V	The Fall of Rome	51
VI	The Middle Ages	59
VII	The Modern Era	97
VIII	The Industrial Revolution	133

ECONOMIC DETERMINISM

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE principal uses of the study of history are to train the judgment of the student and to place him in possession of facts on which to form his judgment. Whether the result of such study is good will depend upon the validity of the facts given and the way in which they are interpreted.

Until the past few years it has been customary to present as history only certain events in the lives of conspicuous characters, such as kings and potentates, to celebrate their political successes, record their wars, and make as much as possible of their pomp and trappings of state. The historian has nearly always written with the purpose of cultivating the good-will of those in power, and applauding the nation about which he wrote. The facts presented have been those which would lend themselves to these purposes and the reasoning upon them has been theological in its methods. That is, the whole list of characters who figured in the pages of the historian were assumed to be under the protection of supernatural powers, and the events re-

corded, whether of bloodshed, chicanery or plunder, were regarded as being providential and for the glory of God. The reader is taught that the same supernatural power will answer his prayers and intervene at the proper moment to save him from harm, while at the same time being responsible for his misfortunes in this life. But while this invisible power is at the bottom of his present sufferings, they are all to be atoned for by happiness in a future life, if he will only bear his present burdens with meekness and submission.

The natural result of this sort of teaching upon the mind is that the moral powers of the individual are paralyzed. If his sufferings and his limitations are inevitable, fixed by a power beyond his control, it would be folly to try to save himself from them. If he is saved from worse calamities by his submission, it would be madness to rebel. If by questioning the right and justice of the present order in either heaven or earth he would jeopardize his future happiness as well as his present safety from a worse fate, he will not only submit, he will pray, he will grovel, he will kiss the hand that smites him. Thus the powers that be in the high places of the earth are safe in the possession of their special privileges and powers and have every opportunity to increase them, while the people are kept in a state of both material and moral degradation. This sort of history writing has always been a tool, used more or less consciously, by the class of people in

power, for keeping the mass of the people quiet while they plundered them.

The Economic Interpretation of History proceeds by quite different methods; its purpose is simply to get at the truth and the whole truth, and the effect which it produces on the mind is exactly the opposite from that wrought by the theological method. It is a study of the development of society, and by society is meant all the people, with their facilities for getting a living, their institutions and ideas. It has very little to do with either special events or particular individuals. An individual has no importance at all, excepting in his relation to all the people, and then the people are the important thing; he is merely an incident. And the mainspring of growth and action is found in the nature of the people themselves, and not in any outside power. But above all, it traces the ways in which the races of men get their living, for all other developments depend upon changes and improvements in the ways of producing the food and the clothing of the race.

When a person sees that the conditions in which he lives are due to causes which can and do change from time to time, and when he sees that such changes are the result of new knowledge put to practical use, or of new inventions or discoveries which have been made by common men like himself, it puts new hope and courage into him. When he sees that improvements can be made by people simply getting together and making them, he takes a new attitude al-

together. Whereas he was a negative and passive creature before, whose life was simply an endurance test, of use to nobody, he now becomes alert and positive. He wants to learn about the facts of life and what they mean and what opportunities for improvement they offer; then he wants to put his shoulder to the wheel and push. It makes a man of him and he begins to take some satisfaction in life,—this life; and he becomes of use to society. But when a man has grown up in the old theological habit of thought and feeling, it is sometimes well-nigh impossible for him to get the new understanding of life; to get the wine into his veins, the iron into his blood.

The cheat of the old history-writing and history-teaching is so coarse and has become so plain and it is intellectually so contemptible that outside of the "divinity" schools you will not find many professors who are engaged in it any more. In fact, teachers of history in the higher institutions of education have become possessed, in the last few years, of a perfect passion for the "economic interpretation." And the zeal of them promises well for social regeneration. No young man or woman who passes under their hands can grow up having the paralysis of the will which results from the old theological teachings. The elementary teaching of history in the public schools has not felt this change to the same extent, because here teaching is more governed by precedent and custom, and the teachers have not

the same prominence to stimulate their intellectual pride in progress. And besides, the public schools, at present, are too much under the control of politics and the school-book concerns, to keep up with the march of progress in education as they should.

The old historical method and the new are absolutely opposed to each other, because the one looks for the causes of social conditions outside of society itself, and leaves man a hopeless derelict without oar, sail or compass, upon a sea which has no port in this world; while the other looks to the nature of man himself for both the propelling power and the guidance by which to reach a higher social state. They are opposed because the former refers such actions and changes as do take place to the "will of God," while the latter recognizes the moving power in the needs of man and the means which he uses to secure the satisfaction of those needs. So that if one man says that social progress is due to changes in the processes of production, and another man says that it is due to human feelings, the two do not conflict at all. For the feelings are nothing but the consciousness of need, or pleasure in the satisfaction of needs. And the processes of production are carried on for the purpose of satisfying the needs which constitute the feelings of man. The consciousness of the feeling and the employment of means to satisfy the demands of feeling are simply different steps in the same series.

The path of progress began a long way back, and

at first it was a dim and wandering trail. In many different times and places man has taken up this trail; no one knows whence he came nor where he went, only that he dropped out later on, and left only a bone or a mound of earth or an arrow-point to prove that he ever lived. Many tribes have taken up the trail, but most of them dropped out along the road, and only a few kept on until they reached the stage of civilization. Some others might have reached that point if left to themselves for a long enough time; but others who were more advanced have discovered and invaded them and either wiped them out or imposed upon them their own ways of living. When tribes are seen not to have progressed, their customs are not to be taken as illustrations of customs in the main line of culture. They present evidence on the causes of failure, but only negative evidence on the means by which a tribe survives and thrives. Much confusion has arisen among students of primitive life by the failure to make this distinction.

It is convenient to divide the history of primitive peoples into periods; and one advantage of this division is that it shows that the main mile-stones on the road of progress have been the same throughout the world wherever the tribes of men have lived and advanced. Important inventions or discoveries have been chosen to mark the advance from one period to another, and these come in the same succession wherever tribes of men have lived. In no

case, for instance, has the smelting of iron, which introduced later barbarism, preceded the invention of pottery, which marked the lower period of barbarism. And when you say "the upper period of barbarism" it means not only the invention of the smelting of iron, but all those economic and social changes that go with it. Similarly, when you refer to the middle stage of savagery, the mind instantly pictures, not only the typical invention that has been chosen to identify it by, but the form of the family, the means of subsistence, and all the peculiar features of life that accompany that invention. The division into periods preserves a grouping of the elements of progress that is very useful in forming consistent ideas of social and economic evolution. Previous to the dawn of civilization and slavery, man saved himself from perishing from the earth mainly by yielding to nature and accommodating himself to her. After that period is reached man makes nature yield more and more to his demands, he discovers many and complex ways of subduing her and making her satisfy his needs. And all his forms of government, social relations and institutions are formed in accordance with these processes of wringing a living from an unwilling environment.

CHAPTER II

THE PERIOD OF SAVAGERY

MAN owed his ability to develop from a mere animal into a human being to several physical causes, one of which was his ability to stand erect, to run on two feet and to use his hands, or fore-feet to throw stones and to wield sticks. Another and perhaps greater advantage was in the construction of his throat. For while the other higher animals have throats with which they can make certain inarticulate sounds or cries expressing emotions of fear or anger or sociability, man has a throat with which he can make an unlimited number of articulations with which to express his thoughts.

His first home was the forest.[1] Here he found fruits and roots and nuts for his food, and trees and caves for shelter. There were no classes and no masses in those days, for all had the same needs for food, shelter and defense.[2] The earth's surface and the rocks show that glacial periods came on, and changed the climate so that the food supply of the forests was destroyed. Then the folk had to

[1] Charles Darwin; Descent of Man, pp. 47, 48. (Revised edition, Merrill and Baker.)
[2] Morgan; Ancient Society, pp. 8, 31.

migrate to places where other food supplies could be found.[3]

The oldest skeletons that have been found show that man and woman were equal in stature and strength of build and cranial capacity.[4]

People secured food and protection from animals and enemies by helping one another; by a voluntary mutual aid.

In order to continue his existence man had to find a temperate climate where he could secure food by working for it. Extremes of climate do not make for progress. In too cold a climate the reward of effort is scant and people do not have the surplus energy that is necessary for development. A tropical climate presents man with his food at the cost of very little effort and he does not have the education that comes through effort.

Man migrated to the rivers and coasts where there was a supply of shell-fish for food. Here he lived for a long period, and the shells of the fish he ate formed heaps covering extensive areas of ground. These heaps are found along the rivers and coasts of every continent, and are known as the shell-heaps or kitchen-middens. Besides the shells and soil, they contain fragments of charred wood, and bone and stone implements. These show that fire was domesticated and used in the life of the folk;

[3] Daniel Wilson; Prehistoric Man, Vol. I, p. 115.

[4] M. Manouvrier, of the Paris School of Anthropology, has demonstrated that the females of the stone age had cranial capacity considerably larger than modern Parisian females; while the males of the stone age had cranial capacity nearly, but not quite, as large as modern male Parisians.

and that they began to make tools of bone and stone at this early date. This period, when the principal implements were of stone, is called the stone age.[5]

The discovery of fire and its use in preparing food is said to lift tribes into the second sub-period of savagery. This discovery would have enabled them to smoke and dry and bake their roots and fish, and so to make their supply of food more serviceable. It would practically mean more food, and that would mean that their whole environment was enlarged and they had a better chance to survive.[6]

The folk lived in groups or hordes, formed by the natural increase, by reproduction of its members. The head of the group was its oldest woman, and her oldest daughter succeeded her. This system is called the Matriarchate, and the group of blood relations thus formed is called the gens, though the period when its definite form can be detected is not easy to locate.[7] The earliest form of the family, then, is the same as the group which is the gens. The family is the root of the gens and develops into it. It consists of the members of a family relationship living together in the marriage relation. This is

[5] Tylor's Anthropology.

[6] Ancient Society, Part one, Chapter two. This is the accepted idea about the first uses of fire, though Wilson in Prehistoric Man, develops a different one, which is extremely interesting.

[7] The majority of writers have not noted the existence of the gens among primitive tribes at all. But this is because few writers have had the intimate relations with primitive tribes that are necessary to enable them to understand the institutions of tribes. And it is only since Morgan wrote Ancient Society that the nature and functions and origin of the gens have been really understood.

called the consanguine family. It is the first form of group-marriage.[8]

So long as the people were dependent upon such meager helps in securing subsistence and their tools were so very simple, they were unable to leave the coasts and rivers where they could find shell-fish for food. But at length, after thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of years, the bow and arrow was invented. And this one invention which so greatly enlarged the economic basis, the food supply of life, was followed by a complete social revolution. The people were then enabled to leave the coasts and river-courses, and live wherever there was game. It not only gave them greater freedom in the choice of territory, but it gave them also skins for clothing and shelter. They no longer were dependent upon the trees and caves for a habitation. It broke up the cave-home.

While the men learned to hunt with the new weapon, the woman learned to dress the skins. At the same period the women invented the weaving of mats and baskets with the fingers. The baskets would make possible a better handling of the food, and these two inventions raise the tribes into the third sub-period of savagery.

The work and training of the two sexes now comes to be different. Woman's occupations are the more sedentary, her experience more narrow; and the

[8] Sir John Lubbock was among the first to detect the evidences of group-marriage. See his Origin of Civilization, p. 60.

skeletons which are found among relics of this time show that woman now began to deteriorate, as compared with man.[9] The woman has really begun to be a slave of the group. The first class-distinction is thus made between man and woman.

The gens develops, and becomes organized. It has its council composed of both men and women who are elected by the votes of all the members. If the gens becomes over-grown, it divides, but the several branches remain united in the phratry. The purpose of the latter is to preserve the peculiar religious rites and ceremonies of the family, and to worship the common ancestors. All of the gentes which speak the same dialect form the tribe; and it, too, has its council, composed of representatives of the different gentes belonging to it. Both men and women serve in its councils and have an equal vote in choosing its councillors.[10]

So long as the meat-food of the folk was restricted to shell-fish, and subsistence was accordingly very meager, the family took no chances. It kept all its own members to help find food, and to defend the group, and it took in no strangers to feed. But when it found itself liberated, as it were, by the invention of the bow and arrow, it began to disregard the customs of the ancestors, and to marry outside the family. In short, the consanguine family was broken up. Groups of men from other gentes, hav-

[9] J. W. Powell; Geological and Geodatic Survey, Vol IX, pp. 209-210.
[10] J. W. Powell: Wyandot Government, Annual Report Bureau of Ethnology, 1897-98, pp. 59-63. Charlevoix's Voyages, pp. 23-25.

ing other ancestors and different religious rites, were admitted in marriage to groups of women within the gens. This is called the Punaluan family. A group of women who may or may not be sisters is married to a group of men who may or may not be brothers, but the men are not brothers to the women. Even this family shows a tendency to break up into smaller groups. When a man marries, he goes to the home of his wives and is received into their gens. The home and the children belong to the wife's gens and descent is traced through her. He remains with her people during good behavior. One of the functions of the gens is to regulate marriage; and this custom of marrying outside the gens is called exogamy. It later becomes the rule, and no one is allowed to marry within the gens.[11]

Language, which must have been very simple at first, consisting only of single syllables for the names of objects and actions, has become quite complex, with the increasing complexity of life in higher savagery, and words of several syllables are used.[12]

Property always enlarges as industry develops, but in this stage of culture it is held in common by the tribe. Only the most personal equipage belongs to the individual, and at his death, such objects as he owned revert to the group.

Religion takes on the varied forms of nature-worship; and the phratry preserves the family traditions of the gentes, which have long since grown

[11] Ward; Pure Sociology, pp. 193, 200, 548.
[12] Morgan; Ancient Society, Chapter IV.

into ancestor-worship. And the sacrifice of captives, as a means of propitiating the gods, has been taken on by religion as a side line.

CHAPTER III

THE PERIOD OF BARBARISM

AS the women did the work of domestic manufacture, it was they who made the inventions of tools and implements and processes for doing that work. Advancement, in primitive times, depends more upon the development of the food and clothing industries than anything else; and where tribes have ceased to advance at any stage, it must be supposed that this failure was due to the fact that the women were too much oppressed to make discoveries and inventions.

The matter of climate and natural products and conditions is doubtless back of and connected with the special situations of women in different tribes. Among the aborigines of Australia, who were in the middle sub-period of savagery when discovered, the women were in a most abject state of subjection. The climate where they were found living is such that natural food products are plentiful; and many writers have expressed surprise that people so favorably situated should have made so little advancement. But when we reflect that these people were able to live in idleness, that nature supplied their wants without effort on their part, we see that

they were without the educational advantages of labor. And, as Professor Ward says: "It is effort, . . . in which the dynamic quality inheres." ["Pure Sociology," p. 142.] This freedom from the necessity of labor, alone, is sufficient to account for their backward state. If the women had been doing work without which the tribes could not live, they would have been treated with more respect. And if they had had the training of industry, the entire tribe would have been developed by it. As a matter of fact, these people, whose natural habitat was the most favorable to life, considered simply as life, were the lowest in the social scale of any people who have been discovered in a wild state, by civilized man.

The lower period of barbarism is distinguished by the invention of pottery, and by the first appearance of the bark canoe and the dug-out. Steatite cooking vessels and a multitude of polished stone implements, formed with great nicety and used with much skill, were found among the American Indians living in this stage of culture.[1] Evidences of an extensive commerce in some of these primitive manufactures have been traced on the American continent. For instance, a quarry of steatite, littered with fragments of cooking vessels, and with chisels of a harder stone, with which they were dressed out, has been found in California; and vessels of the same stone and type of shape and dressing, have been found all

[1] Charles Abbott; Primitive Industry.

the way from California to the Mississippi river. And a man lived in Alabáma who had knowledge of a vein of very fine black marble, of which he made pipes that were highly prized for their color and beautiful polish. He never told where he got the marble, and thus kept a monopoly in his line of business; but these pipes found their way as far north as Minnesota and the Dakotas, where they exchanged for two good robes apiece. The out-door work-shop became a regular institution, and men were beginning to specialize in manufacture.

The family lived in communal houses or villages. The Seminoles had their long-houses of logs, a great advance in architecture. The Seneca-Iroquois had similar dwellings, in which were several rooms, in each of which a couple lived, with their offspring. Thus the marriage group was breaking up into the pairing or Syndiasmian family. This process must be understood to have been a very slow and probably unconscious one. The pairing family was distinctly developed among some of the Mississippi river tribes, while the Pacific coast tribes still preserved the group-marriage, or Punaluan family.[2]

Each tribe had its tribal council, the members of which were elected by the membership of the tribe; and this council, composed, in most cases, of both men and women, decided matters of peace and war, and of public policy and acted as a court in trying

[2] Schoolcraft: The American Indians. Charlevoix's Voyages. J. W. Powell; Wyandot Government.

cases between members of the different gentes of the tribe. The laws consisted in the customs of the ancestors, and the decisions of the council. The early explorers all made the same sort of comment upon the "liberty, equality and fraternity" which prevailed, and the efficiency with which justice was secured, as well as the rareness of violations of public order. Members of the council were elected for life; but there was a custom called "knocking off the horns" of councillors. That is, if a member of the council did not serve to the satisfaction of his constituents, he was "recalled," and another elected to take his place.[3] The efficiency of the tribal governments may probably be attributed in some measure to this custom. Another cause would have been the fact that there was no "incentive" to corruption in office because of the absence of private property. There were no private interests to be favored by the law-makers and judges at the public expense.

Language was always developing in accordance with the increasing complexity of life. Among the reports of the Bureau of Ethnology are to be found a number of articles analyzing different Indian dialects, which have advanced so far as to have a distinct orthography, etymology and syntax. And at this stage the first records, in the shape of picture-writing appear, including totem poles and inscriptions on rocks.

Custom comes to be regarded, first as morality,

[3] Morgan; Ancient Society.

and then as religion. The primitive mind comes to attach mystical importance and significance to articles of traditional use. All this is a part of ancestor-worship; acts which the ancestors performed, and objects which they used, are considered sacred. And gradually the ancestors come to be regarded as gods, and are thought to rule the destiny of their descendants. The worship of the generative processes, as exemplified both in the vegetable and the animal world, grows apace, and a priesthood grows up in connection with the phratries.

The middle period of barbarism is marked, on the eastern hemisphere, by the domestication of animals which yield meat and milk, hides and wool; and on the western, by the development of field and garden agriculture. Owing to this difference in the type of artificial food-supply, a different type of social life was developed on the two hemispheres. In Asia, where the people lived on their flocks and herds, a pastoral life, in which the folk wandered from place to place and lived in tents made of skins, grew up. On the American continent, where the folk got their living from the soil, they made permanent homes, and village life was established. On parts of the American continent irrigation, in which a high degree of engineering skill was displayed, was employed in the cultivation of corn.

Industry is enlarged in this period by the making of bronze tools, and by the use of charcoal. Inventions begin to come fast now, and adobe bricks

are used for housebuilding, paved roads are made, suspension bridges are built and reservoirs to hold waters for irrigation. The shuttle and hand-loom are invented, and everywhere woven fabrics, ornamental pottery and basketry come into use.

By this time, specialized industry led to the beginnings of personal property. Tribes began to confederate, for the purpose of obtaining peace and security. The Iroquois Confederation, among whom Mr. Lewis Morgan spent many years of his life, is a good illustration of this development in primitive government. With the freedom from the demands of war which came with the confederation, men began to give more attention to economic interests. The products of industry had hitherto belonged to the gens, for the common use. But that was when industry was wholly a woman's affair. Men did not produce commodities for the common use, but for their exchange value; and because possession was the road to power. The natural correlative of personal ownership was transmission to personal heirs. Descent had always been traced in the female line, but the pairing family now made it possible to trace descent in the male line, and the personal, economic, interests of the man now demanded it. So from this time on, the Syndiasmian family became the standard of morality. Polygamy, however, was permitted. A man could have several wives, but a woman could only have one husband. Thus the double standard of morality

makes its appearance in history. Heretofore, the sex relation had never been considered vicious. It was simply a natural fact, and was accepted as other natural facts were; but from this time it becomes vicious. Not because of any inherent quality, but because it might cause confusion in the paternity of offspring. In all the history of tribal government in America, there was no such thing as the death penalty for any crime previous to this change in the family; but after the change of the line of descent the death penalty was inflicted by at least one tribe, on any woman who contracted a sex relation outside her marriage.

When descent was changed from the female to the male line the very foundation of the gens was destroyed. The matriarchate, with its "freedom, equality and fraternity," the tribal council with its democratic representation, the communal industry, the common food supply, all went with it.

Records advanced during this period from the picture writing stage to that of hieroglyphics.

Personal gods and goddesses, representing the elements of nature, and the natural functions, increase in number. Spirits of the earth and air and demons are seen everywhere, in the imagination. Rites and ceremonies increase in importance, no act is thought to be properly performed without some religious formality and as a consequence the priesthood gains enormously in importance and power.

On the North American continent, as we know,

the culture of the original inhabitants was destroyed, before it reached the higher sub-period of barbarism. But on the eastern hemisphere two groups of tribes survived until they reached this state. The Aryan, including the Hindu, Persian, Greek, Latin, Celtic, Teutonic and Slavonic; and the Semitic, including the Hebrew, Babylonian, Assyrian and Arabic. In the western hemisphere the Aztecs and Peruvians reached this stage.

After the use of charcoal and the smelting of copper and manufacture of bronze came the smelting of iron. Here, at last, was a metal which was so hard and would take so keen an edge that miracles, almost, might be performed with it. Things could be done with iron that could not be attempted with the softer bronze. Implements and tools that were unthinkable before now became realities. The plow with an iron point, iron nails to fasten planks with, the wheel with an iron rim, the spear with an iron point, the sickle, and innumerable tools which could do work hitherto impossible. It seems like opening the door to freedom, like striking the shackles off the hands, this discovery of the smelting of iron.[4] And it raised the entire life of the folk a step nearer to civilization, by making possible the arts of civilization. Ships were now built of planks, and wheeled vehicles were

[4] Grote expresses a doubt that iron was in use among the Greek tribes at this stage, because no mention of iron is made in the Homeric poems, which are a reliable clue to the developments of the time. But Tacitus' Germania mentions that the Germanic tribes had iron which they used in the blades of their spears at an earlier stage than this.

invented. Animals were harnessed to the iron-shod plow, the potter's wheel and the hand-mill for grinding grain were invented. "Professional men, such as the smith, the carpenter, the leather-dresser, the leech, the prophet, the bard and the fisherman appear." [5] In the normal development of agriculture numerous fruits and grains and grasses were added to the resources for food and forage and are mentioned in the songs of the early poets. Numerous flocks of cattle and sheep grazed on the hills of the Asiatic and Mediterranean countries, while the Peruvians kept herds of llamas, for their wool.

Personal property and the bequeathing of it to heirs gave another value to labor besides that which it had simply as a means of supplying food and clothing. The ownership of property gave a man influence and power. But the product of a man's own labor was not enough to satisfy his ambition; even if he had many wives and children to work for him it would not make him very rich or powerful. How could he secure more? Slavery was the answer. To capture the people of other tribes, or to enslave the people of his own tribe, and make them work for him. Land became valuable, because labor was most productive when applied to land, and the fruits of the soil were at the bottom of all production. So the land, that had been owned in common before, was taken by the strongest men and the weaker tribes were captured by the stronger

[5] Grote: Traditional Greece, Vol. II.

tribes, and thus slavery, the private ownership of land and the patriarchal institution all came into being as one great transaction. The social revolution was accomplished. The strong man would hereafter live in a little Utopia, all his own, bounded on all sides by privation, want, misery and vice.

There is no longer any representation of the people in government. The patriarch is the government; he is lawgiver, judge, executioner and high priest. Democracy is dead. An irresponsible, absolute despotism has taken its place. The despotism of the patriarch. We are accustomed to think that polygamy was the distinct and peculiar thing about the patriarchal family, but nothing could be farther from the truth. Mr. Lewis Morgan, in "Ancient Society," has described the patriarchal family in these terms: "The chiefs, at least, lived in polygamy, but this was not the material principle of the patriarchal institution. The organization of a number of persons, bond and free, into a family, under paternal power, for the purpose of holding lands, . . . was the essential characteristic of this family. It was the incorporation of numbers, in servile and dependent relation, before that time unknown, rather than polygamy, that stamped the patriarchal family with the attributes of an original institution."

The office of the patriarch or chief is now hereditary, and the strongest chiefs now grow into little kings. Gradually the kings bring the lesser patri-

archs under submission, and the beginnings of nationality are formed. Society is commencing to organize large units again, but on the basis of the territory controlled through its owners by the king. But what a difference appears in the character of the people under this new régime.

The traditions of the Greeks were woven into poetry during this period, and previous to the invention of phonetic writing they were handed down orally from generation to generation. Finally they were committed to writing and have come down to the present time as the Homeric poems,—though probably no such man as Homer ever lived; or if he did, he did not write the poems. They were the work of a people, and if they do not record the history of their time with veracity, they do show the customs and manners of the period. In Grote's History of Greece, the twentieth chapter is devoted to the "State of Society and Manners as Exhibited in Grecian Legend." The following observations, gleaned from that chapter, will give an idea of the transformation which had taken place in society.

"We discern a government in which there is little or no scheme or system, still less any idea of responsibility to the governed,—but in which the mainspring of obedience on the part of the people consists in their personal feeling and reverence toward the chief. We remark, first and foremost, the king; next, a limited number of subordinate kings or chiefs; afterwards, the mass of armed freemen,

husbandmen, artisans, freebooters, etc.; lowest of all, the free laborers for hire, and the bought slaves. The king is not distinguished by any broad or impassable boundary from the other chiefs . . . his supremacy has been inherited from his ancestors, . . . having been conferred upon the family as a privilege by the favor of Zeus. . . . An ample domain is assigned to him as an appurtenance of his lofty position. . . . Moreover, he receives frequent presents, to avert his enmity, to conciliate his favor, or to buy off his exactions; and when plunder is taken from the enemy, a large previous share, comprising probably the most alluring female captives, is reserved for him, apart from the general distribution. . . . The people harken to his voice, embrace his propositions and obey his orders, not merely resistance, but even criticism upon his acts, is generally exhibited in an odious point of view, and is, indeed, never heard of except from some one or more of the subordinate princes."

"As in the case of the gods, the general epithets of good, just, etc., are applied to them as euphemisms arising from fear and submission, being not only not suggested, but often pointedly belied, by their particular acts. These words signify the man of birth, wealth, influence, and daring, whose arm is strong to destroy or to protect, whatever may be the turn of his moral sentiments; while the opposite epithet, bad, designates the poor, lowly and weak;

from whose dispositions, be they ever so virtuous, society has little either to hope or to fear."

Hesiod, with his poem "Works and Days," is next in time after Homer, and Grote says of him that "He repeats, more than once, his complaints of the crooked and corrupt judgments of which the kings were habitually guilty; dwelling upon the abuse of justice as the crying evil of his day, and predicting as well as invoking the vengeance of Zeus to repress it. And Homer ascribes the tremendous violence of the autumnal storms to the wrath of Zeus against those judges who disgrace the agora with their wicked verdicts."

It appears that human nature was changed beyond recognition, since the days of communal property, communal industry and democratic self-government.

The agora, ostensibly an assembly of the people, had become simply a means for the king to publish his decisions, and to give the chiefs a chance to talk. But it was so well used for the latter purpose, and the art of public speaking and political discussion developed to such a degree, that the people,—that is, the male portion of the people,—were able once more to bring their kings under control and reduce them to the position of public servants.

During this period, women were stripped of all political power and even personal freedom; and the only respect they enjoyed was such as lingered with the traditions of their former position in society. In

the earlier traditions, the greatest of crimes was to kill the mother; but after the revolution was complete, it became a minor offense to kill the mother, and to kill the father became the greatest possible crime. In the oldest Aryan traditions the earliest deities are goddesses. The first god is the son-husband of the goddess. These traditions owe their origin to the period when woman was the most prominent figure in human affairs and when man owed his importance to her. The son-husband and brother-husband of the early goddesses are survivals of the consanguine family; the imagination would not have produced such deities out of the whole cloth. Life first had to produce the facts, before the imagination could reproduce and perpetuate them.

If a man has committed homicide, a religious ceremony "purifies" him. If he finds himself in foreign parts, alone, and wanting the protection of a family, he is "adopted" by some chosen family, by a ceremony which makes him of one blood with them. If he wishes to receive the protection and patronage of a powerful man, he goes to his house, sits in the ashes of his hearth, and performs a ceremony which attaches him by an inviolable tie to his patron; neither one can thereafter disregard the tie without incurring the displeasure and punishment of the gods. Does a man start on a journey; a ceremony must be performed. Does he embark upon a

business enterprise; rites are necessary to its success. Is he born, does he marry, does he die? The good-will of the gods must be secured by offerings, sacrifices, and other acts of devotion.

CHAPTER IV

EARLY CIVILIZATION

A NUMBER of ancient races: Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria and perhaps others, reached a stage closely bordering on civilization and then disappeared. Others, as China and India, reached an early stage of civilization, and instead of advancing in culture, crystallized their early institutions to such an extent that they have remained nearly stationary ever since; and the early conditions thus perpetuated are only now being broken up by the impact of other nations upon them from without. These two latter nations have been sleeping, as one may say, the one on its religion, the other on its philosophy, for thousands of years; and it is now by the adoption of the mechanical inventions of foreign nations, whereby the economic difficulties of life are to be solved, that they are at last waking up.

The patriarchal family, consisting of slaves who produce goods for the patriarch, and consuming, themselves, only so much of the product as is necessary to sustain life and working power, contains the seed of its own destruction. There is bound to be a surplusage of goods,—otherwise the patriarch

would go out of business. And this surplus of goods must be disposed of. Some member of the family must leave the patriarchal roof-tree in quest of a market; and the accumulation of these marketing persons forms the commercial town. And the patriarch has no authority over the town or its inhabitants. The people of the town form their own laws, which relate to the conditions of city life, and govern the industries and commerce of the town; and thus the city law, or civil law grows up. Such laws are a curious mixture of old tribal customs relating to primitive life, in which offenses are regarded as sins against the gods, and statutes for the regulation of the newly developed commercial activities, violations of which are regarded as crimes against the individual and the state. These laws finally get committed to writing; and in this way the old primitive folk-customs and superstitions are perpetuated and handed down to future generations; the ignorant continue to "believe" in them through habit and the crafty make use of them for their private gain.

The city is a veritable lodestone; it offers varied human association, experience, change, life, personal freedom and a chance for gain, and a movement of the population from the country to the town sets in. The city raises an army for the public defense; it waxes strong with its industries and its commerce, and then it reaches out to control the surrounding country. It sends forth its army and the patriarch submits to its authority, whereupon he becomes sub-

ject to its laws and his patriarchal state vanishes. Thus grew up the city-states of Greece and Rome. The old customary law takes note only of the family as the unit of society; but the city law is obliged to recognize the individual, since it has to control him in his individual capacity. Crimes for which a whole family was formerly penalized are now visited on the offender alone. It is still a popular platitude to say that the family is the unit of the state; but it is wholly untrue. There is a sense in which the family is the unit of society, but it is in no sense the unit of the state, since the state does not deal with the family in any single case, but always with the individual.

The invention of phonetic writing, that is, writing in which the simple sounds are represented by characters which are variously combined to form different words, is the typical achievement which marks off this stage of civilization from the preceding one. It is difficult to realize the extent to which such a system of symbols for ideas liberates the mind, and enables it to arrange its concepts in order, to systematize them, to form a train of reasoning, and arrive at judgments. Mechanical inventions for the use of the hands make it possible to construct material things which were impossible before; but this mechanical invention for the use of the mind was no less necessary as a means of thought construction. The Chinese never invented a phonetic alphabet, their thought-processes have always been burdened

with a cumbersome and difficult set of symbols, and this is undoubtedly one reason why they have been so backward in constructive thought.

The earliest writings about Greece show that for a period of some centuries, though it is not known how long, the country was in a state of turmoil a greater portion of the time, owing to the accumulations of property in the hands of a few men, and the inability of the masses to find the means of support. From time to time the rich would become arrogant and ostentatious, the poor would multiply, and the disorders arising from this condition would become so great that at last everyone would become frightened and be willing to accept any change that would promise safety. Then a lawgiver would arise, reallot the lands, extinguish the debts of the poor, and free those who had been enslaved for debt. This would restore peace and order for a time, but the old system of production would continue the same, the laws under which the disorders grew up would be allowed to stand and presently the crafty and unscrupulous would begin the same process again, events would repeat the same course, and the same remedy would again be applied. In about the ninth century B. C., Lycurgus is said to have made a redivision of lands; at any rate he established a public mess, at which all the citizens of Sparta were required to eat. Each citizen was obliged to contribute a certain portion of produce to the public larder, from his holding of land. If a man became

too poor to make the contribution he lost his citizenship. During the life-time of Lycurgus there were eight or ten thousand citizens. In the time of Aristotle, the number had dwindled to one thousand, and a century later, in 250 B. C., it was only seven hundred. A new redistribution was afterwards made in Sparta, with the hope of rehabilitating the state, but it was too late. Decay, due to inequalities of opportunity, had progressed too far, and the once unconquerable Sparta was overcome by foreign arms, a victim to the avarice of its rich and greedy citizens.

The public table of the Spartans was a last appearance of the old custom of the common food-supply of the gens, with the difference that, in this case it was enforced by the law-giver, by his personal authority. It is recorded that he tried to bring the women also under a similar rule, but they would have none of it.

In about the year 600 B. C., the disorders in Athens, arising from the concentration of property in a few hands, and the enslavement of the people for debt, became so great and so threatening that an uprising of the population promised to destroy the rich along with their property. In this emergency, Solon, the archon, was urged by all classes to take the helm of state, and steer the ship into quiet waters, if such could be found. The rich, it appears, wished him to make himself a despot and protect their property with his power; while the poor wished him

to make another distribution of the lands. Solon took the helm, but he steered a middle course. Those who had been enslaved for debt were freed, the debts of the poor were remitted, and he enacted a law forbidding the enslavement of persons for the payment of borrowed money. Those who had the land were permitted to keep it; and thus, by being freed of one of its worst features, the system of the private ownership of land became established. But that was not all. The ownership of land was made the basis of eligibility to public office. Heretofore, the four Ionic tribes, and the gentes and phratries of which they were composed, had formed the basis of political recognition in the budding state. Now, Solon had a census taken, by which all the citizens were divided into four classes according to the income from their lands. The lowest class, embracing all those without property and those having only a small income, was much the largest of the four. The highest positions in the state were reserved for those in the highest property class. Inferior offices were given to those of the second and third classes, while those in the fourth were ineligible to any public employment whatever. The fourth class, however, were given votes in the election of the government officials, and the latter were made accountable to the assembly of this fourth class. Solon "gave to the people as much power as was strictly needful and no more." But thus was the so-called democracy of Athens put upon its feet, and

the old gentile system of political standing according to race and blood, changed for one in which a man was rated politically according to his property holdings.

Women have now altogether ceased to be a part of the people. Greece entered upon a long period of development in knowledge, and all the elements of social culture, but her women had no part in it. They were kept in a certain portion of the houses, where they did the domestic manufacturing, in the capacity of slaves; having no education and no social life. The slave mothers of a citizenship whose highest joy and pride was freedom!

But like the patriarchal family, the political democracy contained the germs of its inevitable decay. Not only Solon but every other law-giver and statesman realized that the state built on private property must be a military state, in order to protect its property. But private ownership of property led to accumulations of property, and these accumulations in turn led to a soft, luxurious, idle life, not compatible with valor and military ideals. They saw also, that the increase of economic wealth depended upon the growth of industry, and that industry was, equally with idleness, unfavorable to the military spirit. And both these difficulties they tried to meet, with legislation, hoping to overcome the natural laws of society, with the laws of man.

In Sparta, the citizen was forbidden to engage in industry, while in Athens it was held to be undigni-

fied and scarcely respectable for the citizen to work. Slavery was an economic necessity, in order to maintain and increase private property. War was a necessity, in order to protect the property and to get more slaves. And war meant death to the holder and defender of the property, while slavery meant worse than death. Here then, is the insoluble difficulty of an all-man régime. Women have no place in a government based on property, because life is worth more than property to women. And when a man's world gets itself well trained to subordinate life to property, like the Dutchman's horse, which he trained so carefully to live without eating, it "up and dies."

The advancement of society is dependent upon its economic development, but it is not the same thing as economic development. Society can not advance very far unless the wealth of a country is made the servant of all the people, both its men and its women. When any section of the people is made secondary in importance to its wealth, a nation places limits upon its advancement which must in time prove its undoing. And when any section of a nation's people is deprived of a part of the rights and freedom of action which the others enjoy, that society is deprived of a part of the power by which it is propelled onward. In this way the ancient world, both of Greece and of Rome, handicapped itself hopelessly from the first, by its system of private ownership of the means of producing sub-

sistence and making human life simply a means to the end of producing economic wealth.

Fatal results followed from the conditions here set forth;—namely, that those who worked were slaves, and the class who were educated and cultured, did no work. On the one hand a slave has no incentive for invention or discovery and his condition makes it impossible to apply such powers as he has to innovations in his work. And his lack of education, with the narrowness of his experience, cuts him off from both the means and the materials which an inventor must have at his disposal. The result, then, of the slavery of the workers, was that throughout the period of early civilization, no new discoveries or inventions were made, such as are necessary to open the door of a higher social order. This society could not go forward, and because it was surrounded by barbarian tribes who were going forward, it could not crystallize as did the oriental societies. It decayed instead and was battered to pieces.

On the other hand the cultured classes, being cut off from constructive labor, turned their attention, not to the immediate material facts of their existence, but to theories of the universe. And for centuries the philosophers busied themselves, necessarily without success, in trying to explain life by the most general and abstract theories. This effort finally produced in the leisure class a morbid, pessimistic, hopeless state of mind. They ceased trying

to understand the world about them, and either accepted the philosophy of despair, or turned to speculation upon the supernatural.

Some of the observations of the early shepherd-astrologers were made the foundation of an elementary astronomy; but the shepherds were now slaves, and the astrologers fakirs; and so no new facts were observed, and the science of astronomy never passed beyond the elementary stage. In chemistry they got no farther than the theory that the universe is composed of four elements: earth, air, fire and water. In medicine, after all the theorizing of the centuries, nothing was produced of any value, beyond the housewife's practical knowledge of a few herbs.

The trouble with the philosophers was that they did nothing but philosophize; and progress is the result of doing. Of doing things for the satisfaction of the wants of the individual.

This era of early civilization, as said before, was ushered in by the invention of phonetic writing, and the opening of this new door led to all the brilliant, though superficial, culture of the ancient world. First, the epic poems which told the stories of the gods were written down, along with the ancient customs of the people; and these latter constituted the laws. Then came grammar, rhetoric, oratory, logic, philosophy, art, and the drama. And the pursuit of these forms of culture led to a refined and luxurious life. But its enjoyment was limited

to a minority-group of men. Thought was systematized to an extraordinary degree, but limits were set to its achievements by the fact that it was speculative rather than scientific. It dealt with theories instead of facts. It began at the abstract rather than the concrete end of things.

In getting civilization established, the form of the family was once more changed, by the elimination of polygamy. That is, the children of all the slaves but one were made illegitimate. A Greek citizen might have any number of female slaves, but he could marry only a Grecian woman, and her sons were his heirs. This is the Aryan family; and along with it an elaborate system of slave prostitutes of various orders was maintained by the state. There were the flute-players, who were kept at the public expense, but were hired or loaned to private parties for special occasions of festivity. Then there was a class who were kept in a certain quarter of the town, which they were not permitted to leave; the concubines, or industrial slave women, and last, the Hetairai, or free women, who were friends and companions of the philosophers but were not necessarily prostitutes. Thus the price paid for the "legitimacy" of the wife and the heirs fell pretty heavily on woman in general.

The laws of Rome, from the earliest period, had a contrivance called "The Perpetual Tutelage of Women," whereby it was provided that all women, even though they were the offspring of free fathers,

always remained slaves. They belonged to the family estate, like the other slaves and the live stock; and when they were married they were simply transferred from one estate to another. They never, under any circumstances, became free. Later, in medieval Europe, the unmarried woman became emancipated, at a given age, like her brother, but at her marriage the old institution of the Perpetual Tutelage of Women was revived, and she became the slave of her husband.

By the time of civilization, the male gods had come to dominate Olympus just as man had come to dominate the earth. The worship of the generative processes in nature had become debased; the phallic worship had descended to debauchery. The sacred groves and temples of the male and female deities were schools of vice; and the law was employed to enforce their practices. The chief concern of religion was to secure the gratification of the senses, to control the people through their fear of the unknown and to secure revenues to the priesthood.

After the indefinitely long period of years through which the patriarchal family with its absolute despotism prevailed, the Greeks slowly and painfully won their way back to a sort of representative government which they called a democracy. But the corruption of the representatives, for the sake of gaining riches and power for themselves, led to oligarchy and monarchy, to national decay, and

finally to the destruction of the Greek civilization by Rome.

Rome followed much the same course in the development of her government, her ideas and her institutions as that which Greece had pursued; with the principal exception that she pushed her military conquests farther and held them longer by following them up with economic developments. She carried her arms as far north as the North Sea and the island of Britain, on the west, as far east as the river Rhine and, east of the Rhine, as far north as the Danube. And wherever she established her political control she built roads leading from the capital of the empire to its farthest boundary and established commerce and encouraged industry, thereby introducing civilization. Even after her military power could be pushed no farther she sent out industrial colonies, with companies of soldiers to protect them and to defend the commerce which arose as a result of the cultivation of industry. Thus the Roman civilization was carried by economic means to territories which had repelled the Roman arms, namely, the country north of the Danube and east of the Rhine; and the commercial cities of the German country, Mayence, Worms, Spires, and Strasburg, Bingen, Coblentz, Bonn, Cologne, Augsburg, Salsburg, and Vienna, all owe their origin to the period of Roman conquest, either by arms or by commerce.

CHAPTER V

THE FALL OF ROME

IN Greece and Rome, war had been a necessity for so long a time that it came to be regarded as something almost sacred. It was considered the only honorable occupation; and valor became the national ideal. The military profession, therefore, afforded the only means of illustrating the popular ideal. In Rome, as in Greece, industry was considered degrading; because it was thought that it had a tendency to tame the spirit, and make a man commonplace and unheroic. The farming class, which was held in contempt as being beneath the standard of respectability, was oppressed with unreasonable taxation for the support of the military establishment, until farming became impossible, and the plains of Italy were abandoned to nature, which reduced them again to a state of wilderness; and the rural population crowded into the city, where they had to be fed with grain taken from the conquered provinces, either at public expense or by private charity. Under these circumstances the government became enfeebled, so that it was unable to carry on further wars of conquest, or even to guard its long frontier from the barbarians of central Europe.

It is a time-honored fashion of the historian to ascribe the down-fall of Rome to its "dissolute women." This is, of course, a departure from the "economic interpretation" of history. And when the economic causes of the decay of that ancient government are so glaringly apparent to even the most casual student, it is only by extreme perversity that the historian can close his eyes upon them, and go so far out of the way as to hold the alleged immorality of the women responsible. This, however, has been done even recently, by writers who are ordinarily keen at making the "economic interpretation." It seems hard, indeed, to get away from the old, old habit of saying, "the woman did it."

Rome being in this enfeebled condition, and its powerful citizen-princes being no longer engaged in foreign wars, they turned their arms against each other; and the country was ravaged and plundered by their depredations, until there was no longer any security for either life or property. The highways became so insecure, and travel so dangerous that commerce became well-nigh impossible; and industry suffered in like proportion. The owners of slaves, having now no employment for them and no means of feeding them, freedom became easy to secure or was willingly bestowed as a gift.

The Greek philosophers had started with the theory that human nature was perfect,—that if a man followed all the impulses of his being he would lead a perfect moral life. One wonders that such

a theory was entertained, at a time when all women were industrial and sexual slaves, and a large majority of the male population were also enslaved. Surely, a slave could not follow the impulses of her or his being. All but a small class of the people were rendered immoral by the conditions created for them by that small minority who were free, according to this theory, yet such the theory undoubtedly was. When the Romans conquered Greece, the victors carried home with them the philosophers, as a part of the spoil of conquest, and quite a fury for the Grecian culture fell upon the Roman leisure class. Philosophy was everywhere;—philosophy and logic, rhetoric and art. The very air the Roman citizen breathed was Grecian culture. Thus the theory that human nature was perfect became a part of the Roman's catechism. But that theory was already greatly damaged and brought into discredit by the fact that the Greek had come to his own destruction by following the impulses of his own human nature. And by the time of the period of Roman decay, the Roman philosophers had come to the unhappy conclusions that man was not only not wholly good, but that he was, on the contrary, altogether bad. Even his very best was wholly vile, and so hopeless a case was he that, according to the philosophers, the only approach to virtue possible of attainment for him, lay in the ceaseless mortification of the flesh and the crushing of every impulse of his nature.

At the same time, speculation, giving up this life and this world as a bad job, turned toward another world and a future life, which was to be so blessed that it would atone for the miseries of this life, if only the flesh were sufficiently overcome here and now. So the "unemployed," for very lack of employment, took up the task of mortifying the flesh, as a profession. Thousands of them, according to the accounts, fled to the deserts of Africa and to the desolate Italian plains, and took up their abode in caves, ruins and old tombs where they lived hermit lives, striving with the spirit, against the flesh and the devil.

In this state of things temporal and spiritual, the Christian church was founded during the life of the first Roman emperor. The imperial government had nothing to offer to the common man; but the church was organized as a pure democracy, and the disinherited of the earth flocked to it, as to a shelter in a storm. Nonresistance, community of goods, humility, charity, these were the principles on which it was built. In this first organization, woman stood on the same footing as man, in every matter, even to being ministers and going about through the provinces, where they preached to the people and organized the believers into congregations.

The church adopted rules for worship and the conduct of its members, compliance with which was at first purely voluntary. As it grew, however, and its power spread and consolidated, the rules were

made obligatory, and it assumed control over both the worldly and the spiritual affairs of its adherents. Thus it grew into a powerful body of silent protest, a republic within an imperial state.

As the civil government became increasingly unable to control its barbarous neighbors on the north, the church began sending out missionaries into their midst, building her chapels on the sites of their pagan worship, at their sacred springs and under their sacred trees, and converting them to her creed, that she might control them through their consciences. Meantime, she had adopted the theories of the decadent philosophers regarding the vileness of the flesh, and had improved a thousand times upon their speculations of perfect bliss or complete damnation, in a life to come. Thus she was able to control the barbarians through their fears of a future state, though the civil government was unable to punish them for sins done in the flesh. Added to this, in the fourth century, the church began to make use of the machinery of the secular law, to execute her judgments upon offenders against her rules.

Meantime, also, the hermits of the deserts and the tombs had gathered together in groups and formed monasteries, and these monastic orders had been adopted into the church, as a part of her organization. The vow of chastity was added to those of nonresistance, poverty, brotherhood and meekness which the ordinary church member was re-

quired to take; and yet the monks were a great pest, both to the communities in which they settled, and to the church. They were extremely undependable, always coming and going and leading idle and useless lives. At last, however, also in the fourth century, the golden remedy for their disorder was found; they were put to work. The vow of industry was added to the other vows, and the monasteries, the church, and the whole of Europe, wherever the church had settled, entered upon a new career, a career of prosperity and real usefulness to civilization.

A vast development of monasticism, both for men and women, now took place, absorbing throngs of the ex-slave population, as well as many people of rank and wealth. The poor entered the monasteries because they found there food, shelter and protection at the same time that they believed that their spiritual inquiries were answered. The rich, because they were safe from being attacked and plundered of their wealth. The able, because there they found opportunity for the exercise of their powers in the administration of the vast estates which the monastic orders acquired; and for many centuries the craftiest politicians and the best executives of the world were found occupying the positions of abbots and bishops in the Roman church. Women entered the monastic life, because there they could not be forced to marry against their will, nor assaulted by the marauders who infested every corner of the land.

The monk and the nun worked without remuneration, practicing poverty, according to the doctrine of the early church; but the monastery kept the product of their toil, and waxed fat and prosperous. And under this too great prosperity the aims of the church from being wholly spiritual at first, came to be wholly temporal, namely, the acquirement of property and political power.

The church had by this time, reversed its original attitude toward woman, owing more than anything else to the reactionary doctrine preached by the apostle Paul, and to the general decline of culture. Woman had been deprived of one right after another until she was entirely ostracized from participation in church affairs, excepting as a worshiper, a penitent and a contributor.

At the same time that Christianity was growing with such strides, the pagan temples and the priesthood attached to them were multiplying as rapidly in Rome;—as impostors will arise where remunerative employment is not to be had.[1]

The old ideal of valor was now dead and quite cold, having given place to the negative ideal of virginity. The barbarian overran the Eternal City. Culture and education declined to the vanishing point.[2] The Roman language became corrupted by the admixture of the barbarian dialects, until, in the dark ages, there was no longer any Latin

[1] Theodore Mommsen: History of Rome, Vol. I, p. 559.
[2] Hallam: History of the Middle Ages.

spoken, and the philosophers and writers of antiquity were so far forgotten that they were said to have been great magicians,—such being the only kind of greatness which that priestly age could comprehend.

It was in the year 476 that Odoacer, a Germanic general from the region of the Danube, took possession of the Roman capital, and reigned as a German king. The sun of early civilization had now set, and the long night of a thousand years settled over the continent of Europe. Yet the conquered people were from the first better off in some respects than they had been before. For the taxes were reduced and the change from the old imperial system to feudalism relieved the people of many ancient tyrannies.

The German soldiers who had followed the new king were allotted portions of the conquered lands, and so were made noblemen, and ruled the country as dukes and counts, under the authority of the king. It was their duty to fight for the king, to attend at court, where they were obliged to do homage every so often, and to serve as officers in his household and assist in the administration of the royal domain. They in their turn, bestowed portions of land on other fighting-men, who thereby became their vassals, and constituted a smaller nobility. In the aggregate there were a great many of these nobles, small and great; but the mass of the people were landless freedmen, serfs, or slaves.

CHAPTER VI

THE MIDDLE AGES

THE early centuries of the Christian era were a period of migrations, toward the west and south, throughout the continent of Europe. Migrations which overflowed into the Island of Britain and exterminated the old population, planting another in its stead; and for a time, conquered and held portions of northern Africa. And in the main, it was those tribes living east of the Rhine and north of the Danube, whom the Romans had never been able to conquer, who held the country and remained to establish the nations of modern Europe.

Whenever a migrating king and his soldiers conquered a tribe and took their territory he gave the land out in allotments to his own people, and the survivors of the native population became "landless men," or, if taken in battle, they became slaves. The "landless men" or freedmen, as they were also called, had, like the women and the children, no recognition in law, unless represented by some landowner, who appeared as his guardian. A freedman could bear arms and his death could be avenged, but he had no place in the assembly of the people,

and could not take part in the administration of justice.

The land was allotted in two ways: First, every soldier of the conquering band received a tract in absolute ownership, called allodial land. Besides this, the king bestowed other areas, sometimes vast estates, as the duchies, counties and marches, upon the leading men of the tribe, who held them in fee or "fief"; and the holder became the vassal of the king. He was then bound to bear arms for the king on demand, do homage at court at stated intervals, assist in the administration of justice, and he was expected to make contributions to the royal exchequer. Such was the feudal system. The vassal of the king could in turn give these same lands to other men in the same sort of tenure, and they could repeat the process, so that there might be five or six tenants and subtenants to the same piece of land, and the holdings were often cut up into fiefs so small that three or four vassals were obliged to co-operate to keep one fighting-man ready for the field. The overlord was obliged to defend his tenant, and so it became a common practice for holders of allodial land to yield their holdings to some lord and receive them back again in feudal tenure, for the sake of protection. Bishops and abbots, the lords of the church, received large tracts of land in both feudal and absolute tenure; so far had they wandered from the principle of poverty which was one of their original vows. On the other hand,

kings and nobles of every degree surrendered their lands to the lords of the church and received them back again in fee, in order to receive the protection of the church. As the Roman civilization retrograded and the barbarian culture advanced, what with the migrations of the northern peoples toward the south and the scattering of the Romans northward, a fusion of the two grades of culture gradually came about. Some of the German chiefs got the customs and laws of their peoples written down in Latin, but not until they had become tinctured with the principles of the Roman jurisprudence. And the priests, who covered the face of Europe with the network of their chapels, carried with them the books of the Roman law in one saddle-bag, while the bible occupied the other. And as priests and "clerks," being the only men of education, they found themselves in a position to give character and direction to the budding jurisprudence of the European territories. But it was always necessary to interpret and to apply the civil law in the light of the usages of the people, and to limit it in some measure, to the barbarian understanding. Thus, in the words of Sir Henry Maine, was "modern jurisprudence forged in the furnace of barbarian conquest." For the states of modern Europe are to this day governed by the civil law, thus grafted onto the primitive customs of the early tribes.

One secret of the power of the church to impose the Roman law lay in the fact that she had the law

written down in books, while the northern peoples had no written law; and in the further fact that she adopted the civil law in the administration of her vast establishment. And her constant tendency was to extend her rule over the secular and temporal as well as the spiritual affairs of her subjects. She was assisted in this by the pagan's fear of all the gods. And while the Roman priest permitted only the worship of the one God, he adopted all the more important local deities of the pagans into the calendar of the Roman church as saints, and thus annexed the pagan worshipers to the "true religion." And so it came about that the church was feared and her laws respected throughout Europe, and her property and that of her vassals was safe from molestation at a time when the king himself, and the feudal barons were subject to attack.

The handicrafts of the Roman period had all but disappeared, because the craftsman could neither practice his art nor teach it, for lack of physical protection. But the church encouraged the craftsman to take refuge within her zone of calm, and there to produce his wares for her profit, and teach his cunning to the brothers. So the handicrafts were preserved from extinction, during that darkest period until the common man had again so far reclaimed his freedom and his power that he could command safety by his own strength.

Agriculture was revived again on the broad monastic acres, for there the crops could not be

trampled nor the fences thrown down nor the cattle driven off, without bringing down the vengeance of the local deities upon the heads of the offenders.

With so much fighting going on, and no security existing in the open country, the custom of yielding up allodial lands and receiving them back in fee became so general that freemen almost disappeared, and the mass of the population sank to the level of petty vassals, differing little, if any, from the serfs. In England, by the tenth century, it became a common saying that no man could exist without a lord. The "lordless man" was as helpless as the "landless man."

When a man surrendered his lands and received them back in feudal tenure, the tribute and service which he engaged to pay in return for protection were written down in the roll-book at the manor-house, and the vassal was given a copy of the same. He thereby became a "copy-holder," and the class of "copy-holders" practically superseded the class of freemen. So much for the effect of the aristocratic, land-owning power, on the population in the open country, where there was no other organized power to combat it.

But elsewhere, quite different forces were operating, undoing the work of subjection, and silently, obscurely, bringing back the freedom of the race, by the constant irresistible force of evolution in the economic field.

Nature prods on the "landless man" and the

"lordless man" to devise means for the satisfaction of his wants, quite without reference to the quarrels of lords or the intrigues of prelates. And while the migrations stirred new currents in the blood of men, acquaintance with, or the echoes of the arts of Roman civilization gave new suggestions and aroused new ambitions in men's minds. So it was that the old Roman commercial towns in the Rhine country and on the Danube commenced slowly to pulsate with a new life, and the stream of commerce began to trickle again along the old highways of trade. It is difficult to trace the revival of industry and trade, for the older historians mention such things only in passing; and the newer historians have only just begun to open the treasury of records. But there was enough commerce between the Italian cities and the east Mediterranean countries to support a goodly number of gentleman-highwaymen and pirates along the coasts, even in the darkest days; and where there is so much piracy there must be some trade.

In primitive days, at a place where cross-roads intersect, or where a ferry crosses a stream, a smithy will undoubtedly be found. And in a military age, an armorer and a farrier will probably locate near by. Also where wagons loaded heavily with pelts and wool, hay and grain, are passing in both directions the wheelwright will find enough employment to induce him to settle his shop in the vicinity. So

many traffickers will require a tavern where man may drink and eat and sleep, and all these people, congregating and passing, will create a market for the linsey-woolsey and the serge, the seer-sucker and the crash, which are produced in every farmhouse, the country over. Some enterprising man whose family makes a surplus of these things will open a store for their sale; and there, altogether, you have a little town. And the building of every cathedral gave rise to a city. These germs of cities must have existed, as soon as there was enough security to enable men to plant and garner crops, and enough time for the people of different localities producing other commodities, to learn each other's needs and to produce a surplus above their own requirements with which to supply them. Such are the real processes of social life, the real functions by which society lives. Fightings and governings are the mere aberrations of people more or less insane. Such beginnings are obscure, but there are records to show that they must have been early made. At the close of the eighth century, the emperor Charlemagne opened trade routes from the Baltic Sea to the borders of Greece, and made commercial treaties with cities already in existence, at both extremities of the system, while he built free markets for foreign traders in a large number of German cities. William the Conqueror found thriving towns in Britain when he arrived in the eleventh century; and

in the thirteenth century there were two hundred on that island. London had 25,000 inhabitants, York and Bristol ten thousand each.

The towns were subject to the law and justice of the feudal lords on whose desmesne they were situated, just as was an individual tenant. They performed military service, did homage, and paid dues and services. The townsmen of Leicester, for instance, "were bound to reap their lord's corn-crops, to grind at his mill, to redeem their strayed cattle from his pound. . . . The justice and government of a town lay wholly in its master's hands; he appointed its bailiffs, received the fines and forfeitures of his tenants, and the fees and tolls of their markets and fairs." [1] Each borough, however, had its clubs or guilds, for social purposes, charity, religion, and the regulation of commerce; and in the hands of these guilds lay all the internal administration of the town. The merchant-guild became everywhere the most important. At first, any man who made goods for the market might belong to the merchant-gild, and it exercised a general care for all the social affairs of all its members. But as the towns grew and the burghers waxed rich, the merchant-guild gradually limited itself to the more important and larger branches of commerce and became practically an oligarchy, governing both the domestic and foreign affairs of the town for its own profit.

But before growth reached this stage the eco-

[1] Green's History of the English People.

nomic needs of the feudal lords had opened the way to freedom, not only to their individual vassals and serfs, but to the towns which stood in the same relation to them. For every time a feudal lord wanted to build a castle or an abbey, to knight his son or marry off a daughter, to go on a crusade or give an entertainment beyond his means, he needed money and he was usually improvident and poor. But the towns invariably had money, their humblest citizen could raise a little coin if it was a case of a chance for freedom; and as time passed there was ever less and less use for their services. So the suzerain would send his sheriff to the town, and to the vassals of high and low degree on his demesne, and publish the fact that for the payment of certain stated sums freedom would be restored. Even the humblest serf, if allowed to go to the town, would be able to earn the money for the purchase of his liberty, and the lord was only too glad to let him go; for he was always needing money more and service less. Thus, without any legal process or the enactment of any law, and only by virtue of being let alone so that they could work, a nation of "copy-holders" was restored to a nation of free men.

The medieval period is marked throughout and everywhere by a struggle of the king to bring the feudal barons under control; to deprive them of the power of carrying on private wars, of administering private justice, of levying tolls, fines and fees on the population; to organize his own law and jus-

tice, a national system of taxation and a national military establishment. Under the feudal system the king and the barons maintained their private ownership of the land and the means of subsistence, by mutual support. But this arrangement was never satisfactory because of the personal ambitions and mutual jealousies of everyone concerned. The barons never wanted the king to become powerful enough to control them, and he never wanted them to become strong enough to secure independence of himself. In this case, the king in England had recourse to the old primitive levy of troops among all the men on the land. The emperor of Germany tried the same plan from time to time. The French kings, in order to escape from the power of the barons, tried mercenary soldiers in their wars. But the means employed was always physical; the pope was the only potentate who relied on spiritual weapons, and when it came to a final test of power he also took up the sword.

But the maintenance of national armies required national money; and the kings were none too scrupulous about how or where they got it. It made little difference to the working population whether it was king or baron who took their money. But when the king made assessments on the baron, it was another matter. And he had a way of making them early and often, and then spending the money in ways of no interest to the baron. So in England and in the German empire spontaneous movements

arose at about the same period to put the king under restraint, and to place the taxing power in the hands of those who paid the taxes. Thus the struggle for constitutional government began.

The king of England would, for a payment called "scutage," or shield-money, relieve the baronage from the annual need of military service; he would relieve the shires and the towns for a similar payment called "tallage." Henry II had introduced the "scutage" in 1181. His successor, Richard, had increased the amount of it; and after him, John still farther raised the rate, and added thereto fines, aids, and various special assessments. Then came the united resistance of the barons, and their demand, embodied in the Great Charter, that the king should yield to the Great Council of the realm the power of levying taxes. John died fighting the charter, and the regents of his son, who signed it immediately after his death, omitted the two sections which gave the taxing power to the Great Council and provided for summoning all the tenants-in-chief of the crown to the meetings of this council. These two sections were afterward restored, but only after half a century of blood-shed; so stubborn was the resistance of the English kings to relinquishing control of the taxing power. They knew that the economic power was the controlling power, even if they didn't understand it. Green, in his "History of the English People," gives recognition to this principle in the following passage:

"The Great Charter met this abuse by a provision on which our constitutional system rests. 'No scutage or aid [other than the customary feudal aids] shall be imposed in our realm save by the common council of the realm,' . . . even the baronage seem to have been startled when they realized the extent of their claim; . . . but the clause brought home to the nation at large their possession of a right which became dearer as years went by. More and more clearly the nation discovered that in these simple words lay the secret of political power. . . . It was the establishment of this right which established English freedom." The "control of the purse," then, by the English people, is at the basis of the English constitution. This "control of the purse" was the weapon with which the English people wrested from their kings all those limitations upon the royal prerogative which create a constitutional government. The German nation never succeeded in bringing their kings under this control, although, as said before, they put forth a corresponding effort at about the same time; their constitution was disregarded by their monarchs, and the result was that the country fell into an incredible number of small principalities, each trying to maintain a royal state, each supporting a court on the taxes wrung from a handful of serfs and keeping the country, with their taxation, their tolls at every bridge and their tariffs at every boundary, plunged in intolerable poverty. Nevertheless, the first step toward that national unity which finally came about in

the nineteenth century was an economic one: namely, a national customs-union.

In France, the matter shaped up a little differently. Here, the king called in the burghers from the towns to sit in the states-general and to devise a national system of administration, which should keep the barons from taxing the people out of existence, on their several dominions.

In the primitive days, when the country was covered with petty tribes, each having its democratical government, the people came together in folk-mote (or witenagemote) to discuss their common affairs, and each man voted "aye" or "no," on the questions that were brought before the assembly. After the migrations and the establishment of national institutions, the free men still met to regulate their local affairs, and the folk-mote became the shire or county court, existing along side of, and in spite of, the newer feudal system. When at length, the English kings gave up trying to collect revenues against the united resistance of the English people, and sent out their summonses to all the tenants-in-chief of the crown to assemble to vote the taxes, the kings sheriff went into the shire court, and gave public notice to every man of that station, to attend the meeting. But this was most unsatisfactory, because there were such throngs of them, though there were always a great many who did not come. Then those who did come spoke only for themselves, and it was difficult to hold those who were not present

to the decision of those who were. Besides, they had a disagreeable habit of coming armed. And the lesser nobles always voted as the greater nobles did, and the king had no chance at all of making his will prevail. It gave him the feeling of standing alone against the nation in arms. Many of the nobles were too poor to undertake the journey and to live at considerable expense away from home; and their property yielded only a trifling sum when the tax was gathered. And after they had voted the tax, the king had to dicker separately with the common people of the shires and the towns for their share of the assessment. These practical difficulties, all together, demanded some changes in methods. The freemen of the shires were growing prosperous with their herds and their crops; and the burghers of the towns were waxing rich with their commerce. It was necessary to tax these sources of wealth for the royal treasury, and it was very desirable to reduce the cost of collection, as well as to deprive the officers of the crown of the opportunity for graft which the prevailing system afforded them. So, in order that all classes of the population should vote their own tax, and so be willing to pay it without further resistance, all classes were summoned to the Great Council of the realm. But as all the men of England could not assemble in one place for this purpose, it was decided that the people of the shires should elect "two discreet knights" to represent them, the election taking place

in the sessions of the shire courts. The people of the towns were at the same time bidden to elect their representatives, the understanding being that these representatives had authority to pledge each and all of their constituents to pay the tax which they should vote. Thus the Great Council was transformed into the Parliament of the realm; purely for economic reasons.

At the same time, that purely democratical government, which had survived in England, alongside of the feudal system, in relation to local matters, was transformed into representative government, in relation to national matters. We have a habit of confusing representative government with democratical government, in a manner which may be flattering to our vanity as being "free and brave," but which is, to say the least of it, very inaccurate. Hallam, in his "History of the Middle Ages," says: "The principle of representation, . . . can hardly be unknown to any government not purely democratical"; thus clearly recognizing the difference between democratic and representative government. But the English speaking peoples have come to almost worship representation in government, as if it were the very essence of democracy itself; whereas, as we have seen, it was simply a makeshift, whereby the people retained an indirect voice in the government, at a time when it became impossible to retain a direct voice, for want of facilities.

But for a long time there was great difficulty in

getting representatives elected, and in getting those thus chosen to attend the sessions of parliament. It cost something to travel and to live away from home, and the delegate had to neglect his own business while thus engaged upon the public affairs. The shires were required to pay four shillings a day, and the towns two shillings, to their delegates in parliament; and many of them refused to incur this expense, so that it sometimes happened that the sheriffs of populous counties were unable to report the election of representatives from more than one borough. The gradual establishment of a national system of government was suppressing private wars, and bringing the people peace and security under which they were entering upon a period of prosperity as great as any England has ever seen, and including all the population more truly than has ever since been the case. Yet men were very indisposed to leave the manor-hall, the counting-house or the plough, in order to support the public order; and they did not seem to comprehend the opportunity which they had to defend their own rights or promote their own interests under it. But it must be remembered that the very fact of a nation was a new thing to the race mind. The parliament, sitting at Windsor or at Oxford, seemed very remote; the king's law and the king's justice appeared to the unaccustomed mind to be a very lofty matter, and so great and powerful as not to be in any way dependent upon the common man. And besides,

every freeman bore his share in the shire courts, the immediate machinery of local self-government.

Still, the theory that the people had a right to regulate the taxes was established. And no sooner did they begin to meet for that purpose, than they proceeded to discuss other questions and to demand redress in other matters. At first, parliament employed the system of voting the taxes, and afterward humbly praying the king to make such laws as they decided they needed. After receiving the royal promise they would confidingly go home to wait for the law. But it didn't take long to learn that a king's promise was of very little value after the taxes had been granted. Then the system was reversed. Thereafter, parliament passed its own laws, and after they were signed by the king, it voted the taxes; and to this day, the voting of the "budget" comes last on the program of a parliamentary session as a means of keeping the "power of the purse" in the control of the people, until their demands have received respectful attention.

But the English kings were very much averse to submitting to this control, and so, repeatedly, they tried the plan of raising money by the old means, without calling parliament together. Yet in the end, they found they could not maintain the throne and carry on their wars, without the consent and help of the people; and parliament passed an act whereby it met automatically, at stated periods, without the summons of the king. Thus point by

point, slowly and laboriously, the English people wrested from the English sovereigns those limitations upon the royal prerogative which constitute what is called "English freedom" to-day, by the "power of the purse"; the power to give or to withhold the economic support without which the throne could not stand.

While this two-fold struggle on the part of the nation to control its monarchs, and on the part of the rulers to control the people, went forward with varying success in the different nations, another struggle was proceeding in the towns. As said earlier in this chapter, the first town-guilds everywhere developed into merchant-guilds, including among their number those engaged in the larger enterprises of commerce and finance. These guilds set up the internal administrative machinery of the towns, as they passed from the jurisdiction of the feudal lords, placed themselves in charge, arranged matters to their own advantage and developed first class oligarchies, on a municipal scale. It was the guilds that treated with the suzerain in the first place, purchasing the right to administer their own justice, levy their own taxes and regulate their own commerce; buying immunity from tariffs, tolls, and market charges from lord, bishop or king. No step was gained that was not paid for in cash. And there is more than one record, especially in France, of cases in which the immunities purchased by the

"communes," or towns, for coin of the realm, were respected no longer than it took the over-lord to spend the money with which they were paid for. And so it was often only after repeated purchase of their freedom, that the towns were secure in their immunities, until the time came when the national governments absorbed them into the larger system.

During the period of free municipalities, the church was in its heyday; and then, if ever, supernatural power should have exhibited itself to advantage, in decreasing the freedom of towns, the rise or fall of kings. Yet nowhere do we find the fate of populations or of potentates following any other power than the "power of the purse," or rising at any time when the economic processes of production and exchange were on the wane.

Each commercial city had many of the characteristics of a separate nationality. Inter-municipal trade was foreign trade. It was the policy to monopolize commerce as far as possible, foreign houses were allowed to do business in the town only under strict regulations, and foreign traders were permitted to remain only for a specified number of days. But the merchants of all towns, as a class, found it necessary to unite for certain purposes, because the national governments were not then sufficiently developed to perform some of the functions which are required by a commercial society. Local co-operation among towns for the improve-

ment and protection of the highways, and for the abolition of tolls and charges, led to wider combinations, and finally to the formation of the Hanseatic League. This league, with its capital at Lubec, and embracing all the commercial cities of northern Europe, controlled and protected commerce by land and sea, levied taxes, maintained armies and navies, established weights and measures, coined money, kept embassies at courts, made treaties with monarchs, loaned money to princes, made war on nations, and dictated the succession of kings.[2]

There seems to have been a strong possibility of the establishment of republican government by the consolidation of this league of commercial cities, at the time of their greatest prosperity and power; for they were really going far beyond the monarchies of the time in some of the functions of government. But the mutual jealousies and rivalries between the cities and the efforts of each town to establish monopolies against every other town, prevented them from developing the necessary solidarity. The bulk of the working capital of the period was invested in its commerce, and it was the consolidation and flow of this capital through definite channels that gave this enormous economic and political power to those in control of it.

The discovery of a sailing route to India at the end of the fifteenth century diverted much of the trade which had hitherto passed through the cities

[2] Lewis's History of Germany.

of north Germany and the Netherlands, and their power began to decline. At the same time, the feudal system had run its course and the general development of civilization was such that the national governments were able to extend their control over the cities by a uniform system, and the opportunity for the establishment of a federal government by the cities was past.

In the meantime, the craftsmen of the towns, being excluded from the merchant-guilds, from the franchise of the towns and participation in the city governments, formed guilds of their own on the lines of their separate crafts. They controlled apprenticeships, standardized tools, limited output, regulated working hours; and in general, tried to monopolize industry and industrial opportunity, as the merchant-guilds tried to monopolize commerce and commercial opportunity. At the same time, they raised the standard of living and the social culture of their class far above that of the unskilled laborer. Still they were unable to withstand the tyrannies of the city aristocracy, the merchant oligarchies. But after a certain period of the development of the separate craft-guilds, a universal movement for the consolidation of the craft-guilds in the separate cities manifested itself, and the crafts in every town formed "one big union," for the purpose of advancing the position of the craftsman class in the civic and social life. Then came a period of strife between the classes, amounting,

in the case of many cities, to a long period of civil wars. The craftsmen raised armies of their own, and demanded a share in the city governments at the point of the sword. And everywhere they won, in some degree, in some places even to the exclusion of the old city oligarchies. Then follows a period of federation between the industrial cities, on a basis of the craft-guilds. As northern Europe was the strong-hold of the merchant-league, so southern Europe was that of the craftsman-league; though the latter never developed the same measure of economic or political strength. But the league of the industrial cities waged so valiant a war against the princes of southern Europe, that the latter had great difficulty in putting them down.

The cities of the south seemed for a time, like the cities of the north, almost to be strong enough to establish a federal government. But the moment passed without quite the necessary exhibition of solidarity on the part of the industrial class, and the opportunity was lost. The south German league fell apart for the same reason that had set a limit to the development of the Hanseatic league: the rivalries and exclusions of its members. The mutual jealousies of the German princes prevented them uniting to form a national government; but their recognition of their class interests impelled them to unite for the crushing of every attempt of the people to gain their freedom. The king of France summoned the towns in his dominion to send representa-

tives to the "states general" of the realm, where a uniform system for the government of all towns was organized, and so put an end to the old type of free cities and city leagues in that country. Thus was the "divine right of kings" established, by a very narrow margin.

The political vigor and aspirations of the cities had been born of their economic prosperity. In France and England these aspirations were in a measure, and after a manner, gratified by their being absorbed into the nation; in Germany they were suppressed by the absolutism of a multitude of petty kings and princes. Before the end of the fifteenth century they had ceased to be of separate political importance. And three centuries were to pass, during which time their prosperity was to be destroyed by the warfare of their kings, and they were to drench the soil with the blood of millions, before the people were to renew the struggle for freedom, this time on a national scale.

The economic importance of the church had declined with the general revival of industry and commerce, but she had enjoyed a period of tremendous political power, owing to the fact that she possessed a united international organization, and the superstition of the age was so great that no ruler could maintain his position against either his people or his enemies, if the excommunication and the ban of the church was pronounced against him. The principle of poverty had been completely forgotten; and she

had enriched herself by every means in her power, until she had come into possession of one seventh of all the landed property in Europe. Her moral and spiritual degeneracy had become so flagrant that she no longer commanded the confidence or respect of thoughtful and decent people; yet her possession of so much property gave her tremendous political importance. Founded on the principle of nonresistance, the church had become a military power. Her bishops and abbots mingled the accoutrements of war indiscriminately with the vestments of their holy office, and in this guise led their armies to battle. And it was fortunate for Europe that, in the eleventh century, there was a western power which possessed an international organization, which could appeal to the universal motive of superstitious fanaticism, and which could call to arms the men of Europe, of high and low degree. For there was a western migration of Saracen tribes, from central Asia, on. They had conquered the Arabs, taken possession of Jerusalem, and threatened the European emperor of Constantinople. Likewise they insulted the Christians doing homage at the holy sepulchre in Jerusalem. If they had been permitted they would probably have streamed westward into Europe, and the struggle between Saracen and Caucasian for the possession of the continent would have taken place on European soil. The insults to the Christians, however, and the danger to the throne of the catholic emperor of the east, forestalled this

dire event. The pope issued a call to arms. Peter the Hermit, and many other pious men, preached a crusade throughout Europe; and the result was a general outpouring of the hermits, the robber-knights, and all the otherwise unemployed and criminally employed elements. These trooped across Europe or the Mediterranean, and not only absorbed the attention of the invaders, but actually captured Jerusalem and established a government there for a time. Later, better elements of the population took up the cause, and for three centuries, the men of Europe continued to dedicate their lives in large numbers, to the enterprise of reconquering the east. They did not succeed in holding any of the country in the end, but the Turks never reached very far east, or north, in Europe. And there were many incidental results of extreme importance, to European civilization. From the first, commerce and industry were benefited in two ways: The highways were cleared of the robber-barons who had afflicted the country as a pestilence. And a trade sprang up between the east and the Italian cities along the highway of the Mediterranean, which brought to them an era of unprecedented prosperity. Moreover, the people of the east had the better of Europeans in the arts of civilization at that time. Their religious ideas and practices were in some respects much in advance, knowledge was more developed among them, and European culture received a tremendous impulse from its contact with the

despised and execrated east. And not the least of these results was, that the Christians began to ask questions about their own religion, to inquire in what way it was superior, and why they were so zealous about it. From this time heresy began to raise its head, the reformation followed, the church lands were secularized, and a period of decline in the position of the church was initiated which has not ceased to the present day.

Over a million men are said by contemporary writers to have perished in the first crusade; and from that time, for two centuries, besides the seven principal crusades, there was hardly a time when larger or smaller parties of men were not journeying toward the east, bent on the same errand. During the same period there was never any lack of wars, nor any cessation of the shedding of blood on European soil. Yet, strange as it seems on first thought, there was never a time when the female population of Europe was sufficiently in excess of the male population to excite the comment of contemporary writers or engage the attention of the modern historian. The reason why the ceaseless wholesale slaughter of men did not result in an excess of female population does not appear on the pages of the historical writers. Special research is required to discover it. Nevertheless, enough of the records are accessible to furnish a perfectly clear explanation. And that explanation is fraught with a greater horror than the history of wars and cru-

sades; namely, the horror of the witchcraft persecutions.

We owe to Karl Pearson the discovery that the witch of medieval Europe was originally none other than the wise woman or Saga, of the primitive tribes. And Dr. Pearson produces early documents which prove his point. When the earliest missionaries of the Christian church went northward to the country of the barbarians to establish their missions and introduce the government of the Roman church, they found that every group of the heathen had their "wise woman," who was not only friend, philosopher and guide to the people, but their physician also. She was a person of great influence and authority among them; and she interfered with the plans of the priest. And she was such a universal institution among the folk, and was so deeply rooted in the customs of the people that heroic measures were required to get rid of her, and clear the way for the unhindered authority of the church. Moreover, she was the repository of the tribal lore, and as such, had much knowledge of the healing power of plants and how to use them. To the priest, entirely ignorant of such matters, this seemed nothing less than magic; black magic. In short, she might be a witch, according to the old Hebrew description. So, in the time of Augustine, in the fourth century, there was a good deal of discussion about witches, in the church, and that Saint gave his authority to the belief in them. And the old Mosaic law: "Thou

shalt not suffer a witch to live" was quoted as authority. There are long blank periods in the records; but in the year 799 the witchcraft business had progressed so far that the council of Salsburg ordered that the torture be used to secure evidence against witches. Every diocese in Europe had its committee of "witch inquisitors," whose business it was to make complaints against persons whom they believed to be bewitched. And, in case these failed of their duty toward their neighbors, the church employed a body of "Traveling Witch Inquisitors," to go from place to place, lodging complaints against those whom they might choose for their victims. If the witch was possessed of property, half of this property went to the prosecutor, and the other half to the judge, in case of conviction. As both these worthies were church officers, and, being priests, were unmarried, so that their property went to the church on their death, it becomes clear how so much as one seventh of all the territory of Europe came to be in possession of the church.

A witch was said to be a woman who had sold herself to the devil, and had become possessed of diabolical knowledge in the transaction. Was a crop blighted—was there a disease among the cattle—did a woman have a child still-born? A witch had done it; she must be sought out and burned. In Scotland a woman was burned for having caused a storm by taking off her stockings. Did a woman

refuse submission to her husband—did one scoff at the miracles of a priest? She was a witch.

The French historian, Michelet, was probably more familiar with the records of the witch prosecutions than any one else, and referring to a brief period in their history he says: "They were tried in a lump; they were condemned by a single word. Never had there been such a wastefulness of human life. Not to speak of Spain, that classic land of the fagot, where Moor and Jew were always accompanied by the witch, there were burnt at Treves seven thousand, and I know not how many at Toulouse; five hundred at Geneva in three months of 1513; at Wurtzburg eight hundred, almost in one batch, and fifteen hundred at Bamburg; these two latter being very small bishoprics. . . . In the Wurtzburg list I find one wizard a school boy, eleven years old; a witch of fifteen; and at Bayonne two, infernally beautiful, of seventeen years."

Thus the theory that the wise woman was a witch having been accepted, the fathers of the church found no difficulty in extending it to any woman, or even to children. Matilda Jocelyn Gage says that "it is computed from historical records that nine millions of persons were put to death for witchcraft after 1484, or during a period of three hundred years." ["Woman, Church and State;" p. 247.] We do not know whether the computation is correct. But when one considers that this witch-burning blackened

the sky of every bishopric in Europe, and multiplies the numbers of the victims given in the records quoted above by any probable number of bishoprics, the result is appalling. The first witchburning probably could not be located as to date, but it was not until 1672 that trials for witchcraft were prohibited in France, and not until 1784 that the burning and hanging of witches was abolished in England. From the council of Salsburg to 1784 is, in round numbers, a thousand years; and at the earlier date, the business was in full swing; it therefore becomes plain that the number of these ecclesiastical murders is altogether beyond computation or comprehension. But at any rate, the question of what became of the women while the men were being sacrificed on the field of battle, is disposed of. And the economic motive for it is made sufficiently clear.

Wherever we read of men, during this period, it is in connection with some organized body, either church, state, or guild. But we do not read of women at all. One would think that the entire population was of the male sex, from reading the pages of written history. The bearing and rearing of all these millions of victims for the torch and for the sword was certainly a task of heroic magnitude; yet because each woman labored, bearing and rearing her dozen or so of children, in the "sacred obscurity" of her own home, the contribution of women to life has been treated as quite a negligible one. But women should, at last, learn a lesson

from these thousands of years of the butchery of their children to satisfy the egotism of the masters of their masters. This lesson is that "sacred obscurity" never yet promoted or protected the interests of any living being. And it should be plain to all, that wherever man has made any temporary advance he has done so through the organization of his class to defend the interests of his class. And wherever he has lost the ground so gained, he has lost it through the neglect of his class organization. Woman has been the easy prey of every form of aggression and exploitation, because she has had no organization to protect her as an individual. The maxim "divide and rule" has received its most brilliant exemplification in the case of woman. But her ruler has suffered as much as she has for his rule.

Under the revival of commerce and industry during this period, when the members of the family worked in the home producing goods for the market, the patriarchal basis of the family appears again as its vital principle. The husband and father owned all the product of the toil of all the family; even as in the prime of the patriarchal institution. If they worked outside the family, their wages were his. His patriarchal prerogative was still so far intact that he was not accountable for maintaining any standard of comfort in the home, in return for the economic values he took out of the family.

In the beginning of the feudal period we saw that

the knight in armor was the fighting-man of the system. His political power and his social prestige rested on his prowess with the lance and sword, in defense of his lord himself and the king. But later, when the king wanted to be rid of him, he introduced the yeoman with his mighty long-bow on the field of battle and the knight was undone. Then the crusaders brought back with them from the east the knowledge of gunpowder; when they "shot little balls with thunder" to scare the horses, on the battle field; and the knight found himself still further to the bad. Presently cannon were made with which the castle walls of lord and prince were battered down; and then the knight became utterly ridiculous, with his tilting and his capering. Add to this that the money power had passed from the hands of the land-owning class to those of the trading class, and even to the united craftsmen; and it is apparent that a social revolution had taken place. At the same time, the personal quality and chivalric character of the nobility had deteriorated until they had lost all their power and charm, and had sunk again into a state that some historians have called semi-barbarism. The knight had sunk to the level of a poor imitation of his former self, affecting a stiff and ridiculous formality of manner, and an ostentatious contempt for women. Meantime, with economic comfort, leisure and education, the burgher class had risen to the front rank of culture.

At the beginning of this period the laboring popu-

lation had been bound to the land; but with the decline of the feudal system, they were freed and many of them went to the towns to work. They arrived there without money and without a trade and without tools. The laborer had to learn to work and he had to make a bargain with some one who owned tools, to work for him and divide the profits. There were many thousands of them and they all had to fight against the guilds for a chance to learn to work, and to compete with each other to get a chance to work, for the man who owned the tools. There were many employers, and they were all trying to get the most men to work the cheapest, and the competition between employers tended to keep wages up. And the competition between the workers tended to keep them down. But the tools were simple and easy to make, or cheap to buy, so, after a man had learned to work, it was easily possible for him to acquire his own tools and enter the class of self-employers. Then he would own all that he produced—wouldn't have to divide up with anybody.

We saw that in primitive society, industry was in the hands of the women, that they worked together in a free community and that inventions made a very substantial beginning. The foundation for subsequent progress in the mechanical arts was well laid. Then a social revolution came about, after which all work was done by slaves; and inventions stood practically still during the era of slave pro-

duction. But now, when men were working in freedom, inventions began to appear again. The tool soon increased in complexity and effectiveness, when it also increased in price and was no longer so easy to possess. Also men began to specialize in industry, each man making only a part of the finished product; for this method was found to increase the efficiency of the man and to augment the amount of his day's output. But under this system numbers of men have to work together. The owner and employer assembled the more complex tools now, in his factory, and here the tools and the workers developed together on specialized lines. After this, it was necessary to produce these things by the factory system, because the individual worker could no longer compete with the factory product in the market. Development went on in this way until the tool became a machine, and the worker merely an operative.

The inventions and discoveries made at this time are too numerous to be named, but the two of most importance, those which probably did most to liberate society into an entirely new field and to mark an epoch in human affairs, are the invention of a process for making paper, and the art of printing. Hitherto, books had to be written by hand, and on parchment, the expensiveness of which was a serious drawback to the spread of knowledge. These two inventions came nearly at the same time, about the middle of the fifteenth century. The time was

ripe for them. In the opulent and luxurious cities of Italy, whose commerce and culture had been so stimulated by the crusades, the renascence of the literature and learning of early civilization was already taking place. The languages of Europe were emerging from the jargon of Latin and barbarian dialects, and entering upon a period of literary development. The writings of the ancients were printed and had a wide distribution, in spite of the efforts of the church to suppress them. The universities of Paris, Bologna and Oxford were founded, and many others soon followed. A passion for education seized upon the people and the youth of Europe thronged to the universities. The knowledge dispensed there was still astonishingly meager, but this was atoned for by the enthusiasm of the students.

Early in the feudal period, when reading and writing became general among the landed class, and education was spread by private means, the women in the castles of the land received the same education as the men, and this had everything to do with the worshipful attitude of chivalry toward women. But now that the universities became the means of spreading education, a difference was immediately created in the intellectual development of the sexes, and at the same time, a studied contempt for women made its appearance. The roystering turbulent life of the universities was not suited to women, and even where they were not excluded by law, they

were debarred by the nature of the situation. So, while the establishment of the universities was in one way an advantage to civilization, in another way it was a hindrance to it, by creating an artificial difference between the sexes, and making way for a long train of those evils which have always followed when any one class is placed at a disadvantage before another class.

We saw, in the chapter on early civilization, that the position of woman in society is accurately reflected in her position among the deities; that when woman was the head of the social unit, the principal gods were of the female sex. We saw also that after the mundane revolution, by which man became the head of the social unit, a corresponding change had taken place in the society of the heavens. At the time of Christ, the Roman jurisconsults were doing all they could, by the construction of the laws, to emancipate woman from her ancient slavery, but the people, still devoted to religion, resented these changes as being contrary to morality and the will of the gods. The teachings of Christ were wholly in favor of the freedom and equality of woman; and the church at first adopted this position; but very soon, under the influence of the apostle Paul, it reversed this position and deprived woman of her rights and privileges in the organization. How far this ostracism was carried and how contemptible the position of woman became under the domination of the church is seen in the fact that the

latter established the worship of a "holy trinity" which was entirely male. Mary, mother of Christ, was placed beside the trinity in the worship of the church, by an act of the council of Claremont, in the year 1066; but only after the dogma of the "immaculate conception" had been established. But the worship of one woman in that she is different from other women is not the same thing as the worship of woman, but is, on the contrary, a special refinement of denunciation. The means by which the legal subjection of woman to the individual man was accomplished, consisted in the revival of an institution of the oldest Roman law,—that device known as "The Perpetual Tutelage of Woman." The church was given, in every state in Europe, not excepting England, a free hand in the formation of the laws relating to the position of woman, the position of children, and the inheritance of property. And while the later Roman law was revived in regard to all other subjects, on these points it was the very most archaic of the Roman laws which were applied. But with this one difference: that, while the Roman law vested all the rights of mastership in the father, and they were transferred by him, as property rights, to the husband, the modern laws vest them, originally, in the husband.

On looking over the entire field of medieval history, the two great achievements of the period, those which stand out most conspicuously, and are most fraught with meaning for the future of the race are

these. That man has become, in his social habits, a working animal instead of a fighting animal. And that national governments have been formed in the place of tribal governments; and that they have finally been hammered into such shape that progress is possible under them, by means of his organizations on the lines of his economic interests.

CHAPTER VII

THE MODERN ERA

IN the matter of social progress, Italy had the better of other European nations at the beginning of the modern period, both in the fact that she occupied one of the sites of early civilization, the pulsations of which had never quite died out, and in that she had a clear waterway to the Mohammedan countries at the eastern end of the Mediterranean, and her commercial relations with them inoculated her directly with their culture. And the ruins of ancient Greece, lying along the shore of this trade-route, did their part in reviving the ancient ideas and aspirations in the minds of modern man. Thus it happened that the new arts of printing and book-making became the means of spreading the classical literature and learning among the Italians, while in the more remote countries the Hebrew literature, the Bible, had a wider popularity, and served to communicate somewhat of the spirit of that earlier patriarchal period to the northern civilizations. But aside from this generalization, it was the more educated classes everywhere who took up the study and adopted the spirit of the classics, while the

masses found more interest in the literature of the earlier period.

Now, the political spirit of the renascence was democratic; and the greatest writers of antiquity having lived before the age of pessimism, placed human reason above revelation as a guide to truth, and taught a cheerful respect for human nature. The old studies were revived within the church schools, for the universities were established within the church; but the humanism of the ancients was a direct denial of the theory of the vileness of human nature, on which the entire dogma of the church depended, and of inspiration, the means by which it claimed to receive authority. So the renascence was no sooner well under way than the church began to discourage it, and to combat the new views and theories of life which it inculcated. Under the spell of the renascence, people began to believe in the pleasures of this world, and to regard the life of the flesh as a good thing for its own sake; while the Hebrew literature concentrated the attention upon the supernatural and strove to narrow life to the purpose of preparing for another world to come. For this reason the church favored the latter; but the political tendency of the Bible was no less democratic than that of the classics, for it professed to place every man in communication with the sources of inspiration, on his own account.

At the same time, the scandalous immoralities of the church, the sale of indulgences, the licencious-

ness of the monasteries, the open concubinage of the priesthood, all were bringing on a state of popular contempt and rebellion against the ecclesiastical authority. The more conservative spirits had long hoped and striven for a reformation of abuses within the church; but toward the end of the fifteenth century, a priest of Wittenburg, one Martin Luther by name, impatient of the postponement of reform, nailed to his church door a categorical condemnation and defiance of the church, and went about preaching rebellion. There was at once a general taking sides on the question. Luther was tried by a council of the church, and condemned to the stake as a heretic; but the council which condemned him, refused to make any reform in the offensive practices of the church, thus adding fuel to the rebellion. Heretical teachings and practices were forbidden on pain of death, and yet heresy spread tremendously. The enthusiasm of the heretics represented more than religious frenzy, it was largely a rebound from tyranny, and for this reason it appeared dangerous to the secular rulers.

It brought about an independent organization within the state, which claimed authority from powers higher than the state. And for this reason the monarchs of Europe seemed to stand on the side of the church. But if the common people were glad to revolt for the sake of both conscience and liberty, the secular rulers often were as glad to declare their independence of Rome; and thus it happened that

sometimes they ranged themselves on the side of the people, and sometimes on the side of the pope.

Meantime, John Calvin, a Frenchman living in Switzerland, started another rebellion against the church. His scheme was to set up a rival organization, having all the universal power of the Roman hierarchy, but based on a somewhat different doctrine. Thus the protestants were divided against themselves.

In France, the keen intellectual life which had been awakened by the northward spread of the renascence was directing itself toward working out the problems of the relation between the church and the state; that between the prince and the people, between monarchy and democracy. Reformers within the church were trying to work out a new system of dogma and discipline; the Calvinists were trying to float their system, but all without any practical result. Religion became a pretext for political quarrels, and politics for religious differences; and all the time the different groups and parties were waxing more vehement. Finally the religious and political parties coalesced on general lines. In an indefinite way, catholics became monarchists, and protestants became political rebels. By the middle of the sixteenth century, vehemence led to plots, counter-plots and murders; massacres of catholics, massacres of protestants, and outbreaks of civil war succeeded one another.

Philip II of Spain was vigorously applying the

inquisition and the torch at home and in the Netherlands. In England, Henry VIII had separated the church from Rome, had taken the title of, "On Earth Supreme Head of the Church," and had sent to the stake many persons who refused to acknowledge the title, Sir Thomas More, the author of "Utopia," among the number. The north German and Scandinavian countries, princes and people alike, had gone over to the reformation. South Germany was slowly coming over, with much fighting and bloodshed. The empire, under the house of Austria, was catholic, along with Spain and Italy. Catherine de Medici and her sons, who succeeded one another on the throne of France, were trying, with varying success, to maintain a balance of power between the parties. Henry VIII had died, and his son Edward VI had turned the church over to the protestants; he had died, and his sister, Mary, a catholic bigot, had intrigued with the pope, to restore the church to Rome. She, in turn, had died, after five years of appalling butchery, and her sister Elizabeth had come to the throne.

Elizabeth was a child of the renascence; and to her, all this blood-shed about religion was a silly and stupid blunder. She restored the church to the state in which her father had left it, made the bishops her servants, and set about developing the economic resources of her little realm, which she found just about the poorest in Europe, without army or navy, and the prey of two fairly well-bal-

anced parties of infuriated theologians. Her policy in religion remained, throughout her life, one of keeping the balance between the two parties. In Scotland, a violently presbyterian people were trying to supervise the worship of a determinedly catholic sovereign, Mary Stuart. Such was the state of Europe, in the middle of the sixteenth century.

We saw in the last chapter, that during the middle ages men had learned to work in a state of freedom, and that national governments had developed which were able to secure some measure of protection to people in their work. The people had, in turn, secured control of the taxing power, and, by the use of this, had been able to place many restrictions upon the absolutism of princes. All these conditions were accompanied by an increasing comfort and plenty. Reading and writing became common, the ancient learning was revived, printing and paper-making were invented, and the manufacture of books gave a wide circulation to the classical literature. Commerce was highly developed, and the free interchange of goods stimulated manufactures. The new world was discovered; a sailing route to the orient had been found. The tool was growing toward the machine, factory methods were beginning to displace individual production, and the increased efficiency in the individual which resulted therefrom was helping on the general prosperity and the increasing culture. It seemed as if the golden age was just about to dawn. So many wonders had

never transpired in all the world before. That was at the end of the fifteenth century. In the middle of the sixteenth, we see a race whose attention is centered on the supernatural, tearing at each other's throats, each immovably determined to make his fellow believe as he does, for his soul's salvation. The golden age has not arrived. On the contrary, wars of a political-religious nature have constantly broken out, here and there, over the face of Europe. The pope had seen one country after another go over to protestantism until his cause seemed lost. Reform, the only thing which would have put a stop to the general defection, was steadfastly denied. Finally, in 1562, an international appeal to arms was made. All the catholic countries of Europe sent their armies to France, where under the leadership of the Duke of Guise, heresy was to be wiped out in blood. An international army of protestants undertook to contest the field; but the next year the assassination of the Duke of Guise put an end to the attempt, and the armies fell apart. Catherine de Medici and Elizabeth returned to their system of balance, Germany resumed the building of Lutheran churches and secularizing the church lands; Philip of Spain resumed the burning of heretics in his unhappy peninsula and in the Netherlands. But France was too near to Rome for balance to be successfully maintained. The catholics intrigued, the protestants were driven to a frenzy of apprehension, edicts of Toleration and edicts of Pacification were

issued without avail. The people would neither tolerate nor be pacified, so long as their neighbors refused to agree with them in matters relating to the supernatural. At length, in the hope of putting an end to the struggle, Catherine and her son gave their consent to a plot which the catholics had hatched, for a nation-wide massacre of protestants. The death of the Duke of Guise had terminated the war, perhaps the death of the leading protestants would reduce their followers to submission. The massacre took place on St. Bartholomew's day, 1572. Different estimates place the number of killed all the way from 10,000 to 100,000. But there is no difference of opinion as to the results. Pandemonium worse confounded, broke loose in France. National parties went to pieces. People gave up trying to work out problems. The intellectual interests of the nation were forgotten. Again the chaos of civil war devastated the land; and it was only at the end of another year that the country would accept an edict of Toleration, being by that time so exhausted that it was impossible to longer keep up the fight. Catholicism was saved for the time, but the process of building up the Huguenot organization began again immediately. And it was in this organization that the difficulty lay, from the standpoint of the monarchy. An organized people was sure to become conscious of itself as a social entity and a political power, even if it was organized for religious purposes, and the protestant churches were

constantly carrying on political discussions which kept the country in an uproar. So long as organization was only local and scattering, it could be ignored, but the protestants knitted up their system with a diabolical persistency. The States General were convened, and deliberated for months together, without being able to suggest any means to pacify the country. So in 1585 an edict was issued against the protestant worship, and again the dogs of civil, religious war were let loose, not only involving all France, but the protestant countries of north Germany as well. Henry IV became king of France in 1589, a strong resourceful man, and determined upon peace; but though he made concessions and offered toleration to both sides, it was not until 1598 that he could publish the Edict of Nantes, by which the war was terminated. And even then, peace was possible only because the country was exhausted to the point of prostration. Even then he dared not convene the States General, because he knew that neither the catholic nor the protestant delegates would consent to the peace, which secured toleration for all.

Yet in spite of all this religious frenzy, honesty was never at a lower ebb. Notwithstanding the prostration of the country, the tax-gatherers continued to ply their trade with zeal and success; but little of the money collected reached the king. In 1596 he wrote to his friend Rosny: "My poverty is incredible." "My shirts are all torn, my doublets

out at elbows; my cupboard is often bare, and for the last two days I have been dining and supping with one and another." He begged Rosny to investigate where the trouble lay, which the latter agreed to do. And it is recorded that, "When he went on his inspection, the treasurers of France, receivers, accountants, comptrollers, either absented themselves, or refused to produce him any register; he suspended some, frightened others, . . . and he proved from the principal items of receipt and expenditure at those four general offices, so much and such fraudulence that he collected 500,000 crowns, . . . had these sums placed in seventy carts and drove them to Rouen where the king was."

Between 1593 and 1609 the protestants of France held seven national synods for the discussion of religious questions, and eleven national assemblies for the discussion of their political interests and attitude, and this fact reveals them acting as republicans, and having an organization which might have been tremendously valuable to them, and equally dangerous to the monarchy, for political purposes. But nothing came of it. The foundation of successful democracy was not yet laid, as we shall presently see. The discussion of political questions was doomed to failure for yet another season. Political questions were not to be decided on the basis of speculations about the supernatural.

The economic prostration of the country was made worse by the tolls and duties which were still

charged at the boundaries of every county and duchy in the kingdom, and by the neglected condition of the highways; but neither the States General nor the protestant assemblies attacked these evils. The vast destruction of personal property, tools, utensils and implements of every kind; the difficulty of finding seed for the crops, the scarcity of domestic animals, all made the daily life of the people hard to the last degree; and on the basis of this national prostration, Richelieu, the minister of the widow and son of Henry IV, built up a system of absolutism such as France had never known before. The States General were no longer convoked, all power and authority were gathered into the hands of the king.

When Philip II came to the throne of Spain in 1556, he was the strongest monarch in Europe. Possessed of vast territories in the new world, from which he drew enormous wealth, hereditary ruler of Spain, the Low Countries and large provinces in Italy, possessing armies and a navy which were reckoned invincible, he devoted his entire life, his wealth, his military and naval power, to the support of catholicism. He signed death warrants in blank by the trunkful for the use of his inquisitors in the Netherlands, he instigated and paid for a long generation of ceaseless wars in the name of religion. In Spain, as in ancient Greece and Rome, the army was the only honorable profession. The ancient cities of Spain had, indeed, bodies of far-famed

craftsmen; but so little sense of values had Philip, that he drove a large proportion of them to England, by the inquisition. It sufficed for his most catholic majesty to bring over the gold of the Incas, and pour it into the lap of the manufacturing cities of Europe. For him, it served for one or two exchanges of merchandise; for them, it was the life-blood of commerce and of industry, for generations. Yet nobody realized that he was not still the mightiest monarch in the world, even when his Invincible Armada was put to flight by the sailors and merchantmen of Elizabeth.

When Elizabeth came to the throne, England was scarcely considered an European power. She had lost all her possessions on the continent, she possessed neither an army nor a navy. Her treasury was drained. Her shipping was insignificant, her woolen manufacture of very inferior quality to that of Flanders. Her population was distracted by the constant changes in the religious creed of her sovereigns and the ruthlessness with which these changes had been forced on them. The New Learning had died out, smothered by the Reformation, with its endless disputations upon points of speculation. The universities had declined, students had fallen off, the libraries were scattered. People seemed to care only about the forms of religious worship. Both catholics and protestants, by turns, had been whipped into a state of hysterical nervousness, and apprehension fed their zeal, until each side was

ready to send the other "to the fire." Elizabeth made the Church of England as good a compromise as she could between the warring elements; and required conformity of worship, on pain of fines, but she let it be known that no man would be questioned, as to his conscience. From the first, this arrangement was an economic benefit to the country; the persecuted artisans from Spain and France and the Netherlands flocked to her cities, and gave to commerce and industry an impulse which greatly assisted in establishing a state of prosperity. The cities of Bruges and Antwerp were the markets of the world. Philip besieged and captured Antwerp and ruined both. The inhabitants, with their capital, their industry, their trade and shipping, were transferred to London and it became the greatest trading city of Europe. The silks and cottons and spices of the orient, the gold of the Guinea coast and the sugar of the West Indies all found their greatest market in the city on the Thames. For a century, England had been filled with crowds of "broken men," a vast army of the unemployed. An increase in the value of wool had produced an "agricultural revolution," in which the old small land holdings had been consolidated into large sheep ranges and the old, agricultural population had been evicted. Comparatively few men were required to tend the sheep, and the rest were turned out to starve. It had been the custom to round them up in batches and hang them as vagrants to the nearest gibbet.

But the new increase in population demanded larger supplies of food; Elizabeth had a large number of new food plants introduced from Italy, a more intensive system of cultivation was adopted, and a large part of the unemployed population was reabsorbed by the farms. A ray of domestic comfort began to find its way into the homes of the poor; they began to build chimneys in their cottages, the use of window glass became more general, and pillows were seen on the beds of common people.

Portugal had established itself in the India trade; Philip of Spain made war on her, conquered the country, and the trade fell into the hands of the Netherland cities. Philip then made war on them, and the trade fell into the hands of the English. He sent his Invincible Armada together with the navy of Portugal, against the tiny navy of England, reenforced by the battered ships of the Hollanders and her own merchantmen. The merchant companies sent ships that rivaled those of the government in power. Country squires and burghers put to sea in tiny vessels armed with a gun or two; every village on the coast sent its little tub with a crew to have a brush with the Spaniard. The Armada was beset as with a swarm of gnats. Its men were picked off by innumerable marksmen from all directions. Half of its seamen were killed before it could really offer battle; a storm at sea did the rest. The Armada was defeated by the enthusiasm of a people who were enjoying economic prosperity, and

who knew that it would be saved or ruined on the issue of the battle. Philip took his defeat with great resignation, not knowing that the empire of the seas had passed to the one nation which had been cultivating its economic resources while he had been making war in the name of religion. Thirty years before, England had not been considered a factor in European politics; she now had laid the foundation for and entered upon that career which made her mistress of an empire in America, an empire in India, another in the Pacific ocean, and yet another in Africa.

In the latter half of the sixteenth century, grammar schools were established, wherever there were intervals of peace. In England, they taught both the classics and the New Learning, based on the Bible. In Germany they were frankly established for the purpose of "training up a generation of believers in the bible." In France they had made almost frantic efforts to introduce order into thought, before the St. Bartholomew. Men were trying to "justify faith by reason," as if that would, in some way, clear the difficulty. At the end of the century, Gallileo and Kepler were teaching the astronomical theory of Copernicus, Descartes was discovering the laws of motion, Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, Gilbert was studying magnetism; natural history collections were being classified and systematized. Order was being introduced into thought, but men did not quite realize it, until Sir

Francis Bacon promulgated his system of inductive reasoning; in which faith had no part whatever.

Modern history is said to begin with the year 1480; but the modern mind did not make its appearance until a group of men appeared, who are best represented by William Shakespeare and Francis Bacon. These two men had really the same type of mind, the only difference being one of temperament. Shakespeare raised no question of faith; he was neither optimist nor pessimist. He accepted life for what it was worth and studied it without prejudice. Bacon affirmed the unity of knowledge, which he classified into many departments; but he had no department for theology. Knowledge was to be built up by the process of practical experimentation; hypothesis was always to yield to fact. Reason itself was without authority, except it was based on demonstrable fact.

But the mind of the masses of the people had not been reached by the new philosophy; indeed, all the forces of the church, of whatever denomination, were opposed to this new theory and all its works. A denial of the authority of faith;—any faith whatever, was a new kind of heresy, against which all denominations could unite. At the same time, the public mind was again completing the old weary circle of material comfort, intellectual cultivation, hope, despair, decay. It had now come again to the stage of despair. During the period of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, eighteen theaters had been

opened and did a thriving business in London. That was the age of intellectual cultivation and hope. During the next fifty years, they were all closed, in order to compel the people to think on the wrath to come. And they were closed at the demand of the people. That was the beginning of the age of despair. Sunday festivities were forbidden. Mince pies were cut out of the diet of the pious, as being delightful, and therefore tending to make people forget God. The ills of the world and the vices of the flesh were again the prevailing subject of contemplation. In short, England had turned Puritan. But this time, puritanism was not destined to sink the ship; for inductive reasoning was at last at the helm and the methods of modern science were supplying the human mind with materials to build a way out; the way of neither optimism nor pessimism, but of meliorism. This time the world went right on. While the religious and the uninstructed concentrated their attention upon the horrors or the meaningless bliss of an imaginary hereafter, and clutched weakly at the straws of unsupported faith, small groups of men, here and there, were trying, verifying, classifying and generalizing upon the simple, concrete, immediate facts of this world. The ancient philosophers and the theologians said: The rules of the universe are thus and so; any facts which do not accord with these rules are vicious and must be suppressed. The scientist, proceeding by the rules of inductive reasoning said: We will first

prove our facts, and then we will make our rules in accordance with them, and these rules shall lead us to the discovery of new facts, but our rules shall always be subject to revision, to make them conform to such new facts as we shall discover. It may be said that the older method, that of beginning with the remote and the abstract for the purpose of finding out the immediate, is the mode of the masculine mind; while that of beginning with the concrete and the immediate and proceeding from that to the general, is the method of the feminine mind. And the long and difficult way that humanity had to travel before it picked up the trail of truth was undoubtedly much more long and difficult than it would otherwise have been, by reason of the fact that women were excluded from participation in intellectual pursuits by their domestic isolation. However little it may have appeared, at that time or since, the age of Francis Bacon introduced the era of feminism.

But we have to turn yet again to the seat of war; religious war. In the early part of the sixteenth century, the peasants of south Germany determined that they would have neither princes nor palaces, priests nor convents, in their midst. And in pursuance of this resolve, they rose in multitudes and proceeded in the most practical ways to get rid of the intruders, by fire and the sword. Thus far, they did effective work; but they failed to follow up instantly with the organization necessary to hold what

they had gained; and they were dispersed with great slaughter; it is recorded that the vengeance which was wreaked upon them obliterated the memory of their cruelties. Now the Lutheran reformation was just getting under way, and Luther put himself on the side of the princes, saying in the gentle priestly fashion of the time, that the peasants "must be exterminated like mad-dogs." Ah! This was a reformation worth having. Ever since the year 800, when the pope had crowned the German king "Emperor of the Romans," the church had received grants of land of the utmost liberality at the hands of the Germans. Every time a new emperor was to be crowned, of course new lands had to be given to the church. But for a long time now, the German princes hadn't wanted any emperor; and when they had one, they did all they could to limit his authority and enlarge their own freedom. So now it came about that the church was holding enormous territories all over Germany, and the Germans no longer had anything to gain from remaining on good terms with the pope. What could be simpler than for the princes to throw off the claims of the church, annex the church lands to their several domains, and so gain wealth and freedom at the same time? And especially was this true, since the reformation, while it freed them from the pope, was not to free the people from them. Luther would attend to that. So here we have the economic reason for the religious reformation in Germany. The process had been go-

ing on uninterruptedly and peaceably for half a century. The prince would annex the lands of the church, turn out the priests and put preachers in their stead, and there you are. Germany was thickly populated, well tilled, prosperous, educated; and indeed, it almost seemed that the golden age had really come, here.

The empire had become a shadowy affair now, yet the princes of the house of Austria claimed the imperial crown, and Austria was catholic. There was a dispute about the succession to the crown of Prussia, and the emperor seemed to be intending to appropriate it himself; so, in this state of affairs, the protestant princes, who were greatly in the majority, formed a "Protestant Union," in 1608. In 1609, the catholic princes formed a "League." The heirs of the house of Prussia appealed to the Union, and France, and the Emperor, turned to the League. Then followed the "Thirty Years' War." We will not attempt to follow its tortuous course; but will note some of the general features of it in passing.

The protestants were much the more numerous; but the catholics were under the one head, the emperor, while the protestant princes were prevented from acting with any efficiency by their jealousies and rivalries. Each was mortally afraid that the other would make something at his expense, or would come out ahead in the end. So the emperor gained one victory after another, and gradually

strengthened himself until, in 1629, he felt strong enough to issue a decree that all the church lands which had been secularized should be restored. Here, at last, was a common ground on which all the protestant princes could unite. The emperor was dependent for his success on his general, Wallenstein, and Wallenstein now proclaimed that the separate states of Germany must go. The emperor must be absolute, like the king, in Spain and France. This, at last, woke the princes up. The Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus, came over at this time, to save the protestants, and though the Germans rallied to him but slowly, he succeeded in turning the tide, and after that the war went more in favor of the protestants. Gustavus Adolphus was killed in battle; but by this time, the emperor and Wallenstein were quarreling, and at last, the latter was assassinated, to rid the emperor of him. The emperor now was free, but he had lost his fighting power. Peace negotiations had been begun in 1640; but it was not until 1648 that a treaty could be completed, in which all the multitude of petty sovereigns would concur. By this treaty, the Peace of Westphalia, the church lands were to remain as they were when the war broke out, the different states were to choose their own religion. France got a slice of territory along the Rhine, Switzerland and the Netherlands became free of Germany. Nobody gained anything. But in some parts, only one of the inhabitants in ten was left. The entire popula-

tion was reduced to one fourth of its former numbers, and the material wealth was reduced in a much larger proportion. Scarcely any one was alive who had ever seen a condition of peace. Those who were left were stupid, brutal, ignorant and without spirit. Cowed, broken, only caring to hide from their tormentors; it was two years before the remnant of the population could realize what peace was. And it took two hundred years for Germany to recover the lost ground in material wealth and the arts of life. Wallenstein had brought into the country hordes of bandit-soldiers, of every nationality under the sun. But the emperor had no money to pay them and they were commissioned to get their pay in plunder, from the country. They did; and before they were disbanded, the country had been so cleaned of every particle of food, that the soldiers themselves were dying of starvation. They had carried off every removable thing that would bring a piece of money, and what could not be carried had been destroyed. The dishes and pewter pots and copper kettles of the housewife, the farming implements, every cow and horse and chicken, had been consumed. The whole country was starving. Fields and orchards and vineyards were wilderness. The Hanseatic towns, once the scene of so rich and busy a life, were drained of wealth and almost of population. The vessels rotted at the wharves, grass grew in the highways, whole blocks of houses were torn down, whole streets without a single inhabitant.

And here, as in France, after 1598, a system of absolutism was built on the prostration of the people. Some of the popular assemblies were called together, but they had nothing to propose; they were powerless and useless. So popular government was abandoned, altogether. At the courts of the princes, hysterical gaieties, affectations of frivolity, ostentatious displays of wealth took the place of the refinement that had existed before the war. The rich civilization of Germany, given over wholly to religious speculation and unleavened by any seed of scientific thought, had all but extinguished itself in a single generation.

During the reign of Henry VIII, when the religious strife was at its hottest, parliament had lost interest in the development of the constitution, and had passed a law that proclamations of the king should have all the power of statutes. The Tudor kings had all been alert to extend the prerogative of the crown at the expense of that of parliament; but even so, parliament had, during the long period of peace and prosperity of Elizabeth's reign, extended its own power in a number of directions. This growth of the constitution is inevitable, where there is a large middle class which is increasing all the time in wealth and power. But the successor of Elizabeth, James I, king of Scotland, had no idea of the principles of government; he was first and last a theologian. But he had all the Tudor eagerness for extending the power of the crown. His

idea of the courts was, that they were to render judgments according to his wishes, regardless of the law of the land; the church was to receive its law and doctrine, and accept its bishops and preachers by his appointment. In order not to be hampered in his designs by parliament, he laid duties on a large number of articles which had never been taxed before, the revenue from which would make him independent. His efforts to force the church back into the catholic fold resulted in the migrations of thousands of his subjects to North America, where they established the colonies along the Atlantic coast. James fought the constitution as long as he lived; but parliament was then too well established, and the people too strong to allow any king ever to establish his independence again in England. His son, Charles I, succeeded him; but he had not learned the lesson of his father's reign. Moreover, he had fallen under Spanish influence, and he was enamored of the absolutism which the other monarchs of Europe had been able to establish over their impoverished people. He imagined he could establish the same system over a people not impoverished.

Charles levied taxes without parliamentary enactment, caused arrests without due process of law, forced conformity with his changes in the religion on pain of imprisonment. Parliament required him to sign the Petition of Right, which confirmed all the constitutional liberties of the people. It demanded that he should dismiss Buckingham, a friv-

olous and extravagant minister, and redress grievances, before it would vote the taxes. But the Petition of Right failed to bind the king; the parliament repeatedly refused to vote the taxes, parliament was dissolved, and for eleven years no other parliament was called. Then the Scottish people rose against the religious changes, and Charles was obliged to summon parliament again. But still neither side would yield. A "Triennial Bill" was passed, by which parliament was to meet once in three years, regardless of the summons from the crown. The houses refused to grant supplies for the war, feeling that the Scottish people were fighting their battle. The king undertook to arrest five members of the house contrary to the constitution; and the break between king and people became hopeless. Parliament now demanded the right to appoint and dismiss the ministers of the crown, to appoint guardians for the king's children, to control the army, and all civil and religious affairs. The king refused his consent to these demands, negotiations were broken off, and civil war between the parliament and the king was declared. The war broke out in 1642; we need not follow its fortunes, but in 1648 the king was taken by the puritan army, under the command of Oliver Cromwell. Even now, after six years of bloody war, he refused to yield on any important point; and the question of what to do with him became a terrible one. Should the results of the war be lost and the freedom

of the English people surrendered to save a stubborn king? The parliament decided that it should; it could not bring itself to vote for his deposition. Parliament had not shed its blood in the war. Not so with the army. And the next morning an officer was stationed at the door of the house of commons, who excluded from the house a sufficient number of the adherents of the king, to destroy the majority in his favor. A commission was then named to try the king, and he was condemned as a tyrant, traitor, murderer and enemy of his country, and beheaded on January 30th, 1640.

Thus ended the attempt to establish absolutism, in a rich and prosperous country. The next thing in order was to establish another government. A Commonwealth, or republic, was proclaimed, and for four years an effort was made by Cromwell and his supporters, to put it on foot, but without success, the remnant of parliament refused to dissolve, or provide for its successor, and Cromwell drove it out, as he had driven out the other members, four years before.

Francis Bacon had declared that political science could have no value, unless based on the findings of physical science; and his secretary Hobbes had written a work, the "Leviathan," in which he announced the theory that governments rest their authority on the consent of the governed and that they must be justified by reason instead of faith. These theories were being much discussed, and they were

creating a revolution in political thought. Now, when Cromwell drove out the "rump" of the parliament, he summoned what he called a Constituent Convention, to draw up a form of government. The Assembly met and entered upon its deliberations, in the light of the new doctrines. The more it discussed, the more light it saw, and the longer it sat, the farther it got away from the common understanding of the people. It proposed measures which posterity has been ever since enacting; but to the people it seemed as if the Assembly was a body of dangerous mad-caps. The protest against their proposals rose to a great pitch; Cromwell himself became alarmed at their extravagance, and once more he went in and cleared out the assembly hall. Again a parliament was elected, whose task it was to be to "settle" the government. And meantime, Cromwell enacted a large number of ordinances, for the government of the realm. Parliament met, as competent a body of men as the time afforded. But instead of leaving Cromwell's ordinances as it found them, and passing on no other matters, it proceeded gravely with the discussion of them, adopting some and rejecting others. Once more parliament was driven out of the hall; and England settled down to a military dictatorship.

The army was a body of "Godly men," puritans. And puritanism was forced on every phase of life. Festivities were forbidden, the theaters were closed, everybody was forced to be good according to the

ideas of the puritan party. But the administration was the best since the days of Elizabeth. The country was not merry but it was prosperous, and people were patient for fear worse would befall them. At length, however, a reaction came on. People got tired of having to be good in such a dry and narrow way; everybody came to hate the very name of "Puritan." Then plots began to hatch for recalling the son of the deposed king, Charles II. Cromwell died, and, almost immediately, the king came back to England. He was welcomed with wild enthusiasm by everyone. Cromwell was reviled, and his body was taken from the grave and exposed upon a gibbet.

The theaters were opened again, festivities were revived, exaggerated revelries, debaucheries and license made up for the time lost during the protectorate. Science became the fashion, and the Royal Society, and the Oxford Society, for the advancement of science were established. The king was a man of modern mind, but he had no mind to submit forever to the restrictions which the constitution put upon him. And the constitution was revived in its most advanced state. He was good natured and seemed like a rather indolent, harmless fellow; but he proved to be probably the most adroit politician who had ever sat upon the English throne; he was a catholic, for purely political purposes, and in a short time it was seen that he was reviving all the old controversies of politics and religion, with a

view of freeing himself from constitutional limitations. People now recalled the name of Cromwell with reverence, and referred to the good days of his reign.

It is not necessary to trace the details of English history further; we have seen enough to illustrate the hopeless confusion, the loss, the plot and counter-plot, which mark the struggle between a people and a monarchy, even at its best. Sir Thomas More said, during the reign of Henry VIII, that governments are simply a conspiracy of the rich against the poor, the strong against the weak; which conspiracy is carried out under the forms of law. After following the course of the history of any nation for a few centuries, one sees that this is the best possible characterization of it;—simply an unending, ever changing, kaleidoscope of conspiracy. But we seldom see the price which the poor and the weak, made poor and weak by this very conspiracy, pay for the ignoble victories of the conspirators.

In France, after the edict of Nantes, by which religious peace was secured, Richelieu, and after him, Mazarin, applied themselves to the administration of the country and strengthening the monarchy. By the time of Louis XIV, grandson of Henry IV, France had become the overshadowing power in Europe. What peace and order had done under Elizabeth, for England, was now done for France, on a much larger scale, and in a country of richer natural resources. With this difference: that in England,

the parliament was well established before the period of great growth set in, and its isolated position protected it from invasion and removed it from the center of popish plots, and the strength of the nation was the strength of its people. In this way the middle class was able to keep abreast of the crown. The great finance minister of Louis XIV, Colbert, created undreamed-of sources of revenue for the crown, by developing the industry and commerce of the country. He constructed roads, canals, bridges; he planted new industries and removed tariffs, tolls and charges. Under this administration, prosperity received such an impulse as had never before been even suggested; but it was mostly drained into the coffers of the king. The national strength of France was the strength of the monarch; not its people. The splendor of his court and the magnificence of his armies became the wonder of the world. The smaller powers of Europe were obliged to combine their forces to protect themselves against his schemes of conquest. But now the conscience of the king of France began to trouble him. He was neglecting to defend the interests of religion as he should. There were fifteen hundred thousand protestants in his realm. It would never do. So the people were commanded to become converted; conversions were bought where that was possible. Where they resisted, dragoons were quartered upon them, with instructions to annoy, torture and abuse them until they would yield. The protestant

churches were all torn down, the people forced to go to mass. They were forbidden to leave the kingdom on pain of the galleys and slavery. Many thousands, nevertheless, did escape, and took up arms with the enemies of France. The industries were abandoned, the country was desolated by the civil wars which broke out in many parts, the wealth and power of the monarchy disappeared and France sank to her old level among the European powers.

The States General had not been called together since 1614; and the people had no governmental machinery of their own. It was the genius of Colbert which created and set up that economic system on which the monarchy depended for its splendor. But now Colbert was dead, and he left no successor. And when the glittering exterior of France collapsed it was found to be very hollow inside. In the reign of Louis XV, the local judicial bodies, called parliaments, showed a disposition to unite and form some sort of national organization; but they were promptly dismembered and suppressed, while the king stated his position in these words: "In my person alone resides the sovereign power, of which the special characteristic is the spirit of council, justice and reason: it is from me alone that my courts have their existence and authority. It is to me alone that the legislative power belongs, without dependence and without partition. My people are but one with me, and the rights and interests of the nation whereof men dare to make a body separate

from the monarch are necessarily united with my own and rest only in my hands." But with all the king's "sovereign power," the economic foundations of the nation's prosperity were allowed to decay. The king, for a time, renewed the military prestige of the nation in foreign wars; but this did not reduce the price of bread. The nobility and the church were exempt from taxes, the entire burden of which was borne by the poor. A system of road improvement was begun, but the peasants were put to forced labor, to get the work done. Food was scarce and the price of grain was raised by a corner of the market; it was known that the king was interested in the monopoly. Such was the economic condition of France and the economic efficiency of the "sovereign power," at the time when the new philosophical and political ideas were breaking down men's ideas of the holiness of the church and the divine right of the monarchy.

The French Academy had founded itself, by the spontaneous organization of a company of friendly philosophers and writers, for their own pleasure. But it had pleased Cardinal Richelieu to give it his official patronage and sanction; and it continued afterward a rallying-point for French thought and letters. All through the reign of Louis XIV rationalism and the old ideas struggled in confusion. The Academy brought forth the Encyclopædists, and a concerted effort was made by them to systematize knowledge according to the new ideas.

But it was not until the time of Voltaire, in the reign of Louis XV, that a thinker arrived who was able to tear away the last shreds of the veil of superstition. Voltaire and the group of philosophers who gathered around him dominated the political thought of the world, just at the time when the economic decay of France was driving her people to despair; when the American colonies of Great Britain were realizing that their industries and their commerce could never thrive until they could make and enforce their own laws; and when Germany had regained the ground, in population, wealth and culture, lost in the thirty years' war, one hundred and fifty years before.

The philosophers boldly declared the doctrine of freedom, equality and fraternity, and denied the divine right of kings. This doctrine was very useful to the burgher class, who would naturally feel inclined to claim any political privileges which they could pay for, and their support could earn from the powers in control. It also had a marvelous fascination for the man lower down. In it he saw the restoration of his humanhood to its natural estate, for which he longed as a captive for his home. And it was, in the main, the energy generated in the common man by this golden dream, which won the right to rule, for the wealthy middle class, in the century to come.

The war for independence, in America, excited the most intense enthusiasm among the philosophers

and dreamers of the European states. The enthusiasm reached such a height in France that the king was compelled to declare war in behalf of the American colonies, and the entire continent watched the struggle with breathless eagerness. America was to be the test of their ideals; in her their dreams were to come true. And those dreams were cherished with a devotion in proportion to their lack of freedom.

Louis XV died in 1774, two years before the Declaration of Independence on the part of the American colonies. He left an absolute monarchy, with a very poor economic administration and tottering under a heavy load of ancient sins against its people. He left a people frantic with resentment and intoxicated with the smell of battle wafted from America; and, he left all to a son who was a simple, kindly gentlemen, without the slightest comprehension of the situation or its needs.

The successful issue of the war in America and the establishment of a republic fed the flame of popular enthusiasm in France; as something having special meaning for their own people. In Germany, it was watched as a new planet discovered in the far-off heavens.

The situation in France growing worse all the time, and the democratic enthusiasm becoming stronger, led to a clamor for the restoration of the States General, which had not been called together since 1614. It was called in 1789, resolved itself into a Constit-

uent Assembly, and after two years' labor brought forth a constitution for the monarchy. But it was simply a political system and not an administrative machine, which was what the country needed. The ship of state remained stuck in the mud; the clamor became constantly worse. In 1791 the Constituent Assembly dissolved, the constitution was torn up, a new Assembly was called, the monarchy was abolished and a republican constitution was drawn up. Still the ship of state refused to budge. Orators orated, political theorists declaimed; yet no economic administration was established. A national convention was elected by universal suffrage in 1792; the royalists were thrown into prison, the prison doors were thrown open and the prisoners massacred by the mob while the convention sat; there was no head to the government. The king and queen were beheaded, the royalists were guillotined, then the moderate republicans were sent to the block. Now the ship of state listed badly to port, and the fires went out under the boilers. Of the crew which remained, everybody suspected everybody else, and to be "suspect" was to be beheaded. The Reign of Terror was followed by the Directory, the Directory by the Consulate, and the Consulate by the Empire of Napoleon. Then France abandoned itself for ten years to the worst vices of kings; to wars of revenge and of conquest. The allied European powers came to the gates of Paris, drove out the military dictator and restored the Bourbon dynasty.

After this, revolution and counter-revolution succeeded fast and furiously in France, until the middle of the 19th century. But in the meantime, another revolution had begun, of a kind which knows no turning back; namely, the economic revolution.

The courts of the German states had long been centres of philosophy, science and art, at the same time that political aspirations were sternly repressed and the systems of absolute monarchy were maintained. But as the middle of the 19th century approached, the peoples of both Germany and France, with one common universal impulse, burst their political bonds, and by the irresistible power of inward growth, each people raised itself one step higher on the ladder of political freedom. France became a republic and Germany a collection of constitutional monarchies, which later coalesced into the German Empire.

Parliamentary government, or that type which prevails along with the lodgment of wealth in the hands of the middle class, was now established through the more important states of the western world. Again it would seem as if the golden age was about to appear. But no! Practical vices immediately began to manifest themselves in the system; and at the same time, new forces were set at work by the economic revolution, which were destined to overturn the parliamentary system of government, and establish the industrial democracy in its stead.

CHAPTER VIII

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

IT is impossible to follow all the developments of manufacturing implements, by means of which the tool grew into the machine; but about the year 1770 a number of inventions were made which placed the spinning and weaving processes on a new footing. The steam engine was at the same time developed to such a point of efficiency that it became possible to use it to supply power for the turning of machinery. The possibility of using steam for power, in turn, gave a tremendous impulse to the invention of machinery of every kind. The steam engine was soon used for purposes of navigation and not long after, for traction. And these inventions mark again the opening of the door to a new state of social life. It will now be our business to outline briefly some of the changes which followed.

In earlier times, the workman owned his own tools, and he didn't have to divide up with any one else, when his product was sold. But now, with every new advance in invention, the machine became more difficult for the worker to own. It was now practically impossible for the workman to be-

come a self-employer; for he could neither make nor buy the machine, nor could he complete the article made by working alone.[1] As machines became more expensive it became necessary for employers to combine their capital for the building of larger and more efficient plants; and thus the company is formed. Before forming the company the employers were obliged to compete with each other in the labor market; but now competition between them ceased, and one cause which had operated to keep wages up, disappeared. In earlier times, the large aggregations of capital had been engaged in commerce, and the commercial class had gained the upper hand in politics. But from this time, industrial enterprises claim a constantly larger share of capital, and the owners of the industries gain a corresponding share of political control.

By improvements in machinery and combinations of capital a great gain in efficiency is produced. More goods are turned out by the same number of men. But these men can not buy back the increased quantity of goods they make; because they do not get any more wages than they did before—at least not more in proportion to their increased product. And so another market must be found for the goods.

Wars and explorations in America consumed a considerable amount of goods and yielded a certain amount of gold, thus helping the market. Com-

[1] Karl Marx: Capital, Chapters XIII, XIV, XV.

merce with India and the forcible administration and control of her affairs served to drain fabulous sums of gold from her industries into the private coffers of Europe; though the amount of European goods returned to the Orient was not comparatively large. But the commercial relations of manufacturing Europe were extended and the field for a wider market began to open. The big corporation, able to buy better machinery with its larger funds, drove out the small producer. It could undersell him in the market. At the same time the market expanded and the corporation followed it up.[2] Goods were so cheapened that as long as people had money to buy with, the large demand for goods kept wages up pretty well and thus increased the buying power of the workers. America was colonized. Its buying power helped the market; but soon it very perversely began to manufacture for its own needs and for export, in spite of restrictive laws. And finally, tired of foreign made laws, it threw off its allegiance to England, primarily, so that it could control its own industry and commerce.[3] With the spreading of population in the United States, with the millions of people who were assimilated and their buying power increased, it took some time to satisfy the demand for commodities. But after a time the inevitable happened. Surplus goods, goods which the workers could not buy back

[2] Karl Marx: Capital, Chapter XV.
[3] A. M. Simons: Class Struggles in America, pp. 17-18.

with their wages, piled up. There was no demand for them, and so the factories closed down, and there was a "panic." Manufacturers who had borrowed money that they could not pay, failed. And the banks they had borrowed of failed. The accumulated profits of manufacture, no longer finding profitable investment, rested in the banks. There was an overproduction of goods and an oversupply of money. Men who wanted to work, to earn the money to buy the goods, were locked out of the factories. Their families starved while the money was idle, while the goods deteriorated. Production could not be resumed until commodities, bought with the savings of the more provident, were reduced to such a level that the demand exceeded the supply on hand. A war, or some great catastrophe, such as a fire, a flood or an earthquake—anything that causes an extraordinary consumption of goods will retard the approach of a "panic" or relieve one already in existence—at a cost of human life. Otherwise, the expenditure of the savings of the thrifty, while the unfortunate suffer destitution, is the only remedy.[4]

The machine having reached a high state of development, successful competition among producers

[4] Gunton: Principles of Social Economics, Chapter V. Professor Gunton's theory of crises is excellently put; with the exception that his idea of the reason why the workingman fails to buy back the equivalent of the goods he produces is rather curious. In conjunction with this, Chapter XXV of Marx's Capital should be read. Under the heading, "Effect of crises on the best paid part of the Working Class," a correct idea of the causes of the workingman's failure to consume is given.

came to depend upon the control of large financial resources and upon the organization of selling facilities. Large financial institutions came to be allied with the large industrial concerns. The officials of the one often being the same persons that officered the other. And under the financial system the smaller banking institutions became simply feeders for the larger ones, so that the whole of society sent its contributions, in the form of deposits and savings, to the support of the large financial and industrial concerns.

Competitive selling proved wasteful and so the big corporations in the same lines of production combined and formed the trust. In this process of consolidation small producers are forced to sell to the combination by being subjected to a disastrous competition which proves fatal to the weaker party. The smaller units of production are then closed down at the pleasure of the trust; and those that refuse to come in are ruined and their competition eliminated. Thus a condition is created that approaches ever more nearly to monopoly. As the condition of monopoly develops it becomes more possible to control both the selling price of the product and that of raw materials entering into it. The price of the latter is depressed until the profit in it is almost or quite abolished, and thus the producers of it are put out of business, or reduced to a low level of living. At the same time the price of the finished product is so advanced that the con-

sumption of it is restricted. Thus, people are thrown out of employment at both ends of the series, and the consuming power of the public is reduced both by the increase in the price of the finished product, and by the loss of wages to the workers.

The improved machinery requires less strength and skill in its operation. A woman can operate it as well as a man, and she will work for lower wages than he. A child can often fill the place of either a man or woman, and will work for lower wages than either. So men are driven out by women, and women by children. Thus the unemployed problem arrives; and the child-laborer appears. And social conditions have produced the woman who works in the factory, bears children, cares for the children and the home, all at the same time. So long as their domestic relations fail to yield support to them women must seek support by work outside of domestic relations. And so long as the employer can play these women against the man laborers he will reduce the wages of the men, in view of the lower wages of the women.

These conditions arise in all the industrial countries at the same time and they are constantly working toward an industrial crisis by reducing the purchasing power of the workers, so that the goods produced can not be bought back and consumed. Then we have "over-production." As machinery becomes more perfect, and industrial organization more efficient, the conditions which cause crises—

a breaking down of the system of production—operate with more swiftness, so that one crisis succeeds another with shorter intervals between. The process of concentration would be perfect when the international trust is formed and its monopoly of the world-market becomes complete. It would then control the finances of the world, as it now dominates those of the nation; and it would be the absolute arbiter of the production of the raw materials which enter into its product. It could then withhold its money in its vaults, refuse to pay a living price for its raw materials or a living wage to its workers, thus making both production and consumption impossible. Both the monopoly and society would be brought to a standstill. This result will be accomplished in the natural sequence of events, by pursuing the course of competition, concentration and monopoly. The thing that the trust now sighs for is new markets to conquer. As long as new buyers can be found who derive their money from some source outside this series of operations, the wheels of manufacture can continue to turn. The spread of population over new areas of the United States has caused a constant expansion of the market in this country. But the frontier has now been pushed over into the Pacific, and the unfilled areas between are comparatively unimportant. Thus the expansion of the market has almost reached its limits. The Orient is opening up a world-market, but is at the same time enter-

ing the world-competition as a producer and seller. No more new markets of ultimate importance are now to be found. The question has become one of enabling the same people who make the goods to consume the goods. This can only come about when the workers receive in wages a value equivalent to that which they produce. When this is done there will no longer be a profit to the owner of the machinery of production. He will no longer have an "incentive" to own and operate the machinery. Production will have to be conducted for the sake of consumption. And the producers and consumers will have to conduct it. Whether the course of evolution shall be permitted to work out to the end, or how far it shall be permitted to go in that direction must depend upon the workers, and those who realize the nature of the process. If they come to an understanding of the operation of the system, and if it is their will to take over the machinery of production at an intermediate stage, they will thereby save society from the wholesale wretchedness and sacrifice of life that would been entailed in the working out of the process.

As the capitalist system of production works itself out, the functions of government come to consist more and more in the regulation of industry and commerce and less in the subjection and control of persons. A political democracy tends to become an industrial democracy. Under monarchical governments women have no political impor-

tance because they can not bear arms for the king, and as their function of giving birth to soldiers is a necessary incident of getting their living and is performed involuntarily, their support of the government is a foregone conclusion. So they have no political rights whatever. Under a political democracy the conditions in regard to women are practically the same. But as capitalist production brings woman into the industrial world, her immediate industrial relations place her on the same footing as the men in society. Bearing arms has ceased to be an important function of the citizen, and woman is as important in the industrial world as man, hence her claims and her needs are the same. The working women of the world are now beginning to realize what their position and their needs are, and to demand recognition in the government, in keeping with their just claims.

The stage of domestic manufacture, with the simple tools, is favorable to the unity of the patriarchal family. The patriarch conducts the commercial relations of the family, the money return for the industry of the family is received by him and owned and controlled by him. This keeps the interests of the family united, in their dependence upon the good will and complaisance of the patriarch. But, when the family go into the factory to work, their wages come to them as individuals, in return for individual labor, not as members of a family acting through a head. To be sure, he

owns their wages, legally; but is he entitled to take them? Perhaps he is. But the question will suggest itself; and at any rate he no longer appears quite in the rôle of generous dispenser that he formerly did. The family is no longer dependent upon its head for a chance to work; and this fact is a great leveler of patriarchs. Under the old régime of domestic production, the planting, the growing and reaping of crops, the preparing of materials, the mutual pride in the product which was the joint reward of co-operative labor formed many intimate associations of interest which bound the family together in its feelings and habits. These ties are disrupted by the change to factory labor.

Under the domestic system of production the individual was dependent upon the family for a chance to work. Under social production he is dependent upon society for a chance to work. At present, while the machinery of social production is in the hands of the corporations, the individual is dependent on the corporation. But this is only a transition stage. If he can not find work for the corporation in the place where his family lives, he must leave the family to follow the work. There is nothing inscrutable about the reason why the family began to disintegrate at the time when the application of steam power to machines enabled the manufacturers to gather in the towns. Then many people whose families remained at home followed the factory to the town for work.

We have seen how the ties of mutual interest and common experience are disrupted by the transference of industry from the home to the factory. We have seen members of the family forsake the roof-tree in pursuit of work. We have seen the wife and child receiving their pay for work done, not through the patriarch, and in uncertain quantity, as formerly, but from the corporation, in definite, fixed wages. We now see the patriarch, no longer a "liberal provider," out of work perhaps, while his family support themselves, and even him. He is utterly bereft of every substantial possession and power upon which his state of patriarchal privilege was originally based. The attitude of the family toward him and toward each other inevitably undergoes a change. And he, necessarily, views his own position in the family in a different light from what he formerly did. To his wife the following considerations present themselves: The woman who marries may not escape the necessity of working for wages. She incurs the possibility of having a large family for whom she must care on means that are scant and uncertain at best. She may at any time have to add the labor of the wage worker to the responsibilities of motherhood, the pains of maternity and the care of the household. Is she justified, from the standpoint of her own interests or the interests of her possible children, in creating such a situation? As for the children, they are born into a world whose domestic and so-

cial arrangements are formed, very poorly, on an adult scale, to serve the special interests of a small class of adults. They are launched into a vortex of tumult and nerve strain. The atmosphere of tranquillity, affording alternate exercise and repose, which is necessary for normal and healthy development, is wholly denied to them. The home shifts from time to time. Light, food, air, space, all are inadequate or polluted. The parents are irritable from the constant friction and anxiety of the predicament in which they live. Naturally, none of them can love "the home" very deeply. The children feel little reverence for the parents whose helplessness exposes the family to such a life. There are few common activities and interests between the members of the family, hence there are few strong ties. The companions of the alleyways and streets form the social circle of the young, and the cheap theatres which offer their attractions at short intervals along the city streets fill up that vacuum in their experience which the nature of man abhors. Children living in these conditions do not have a reasonable chance to grow up with strong minds in sound bodies. Nor can this kind of youthful life develop those ideas of fair and right conduct, that honorable and dignified attitude of mind which are essential to good citizenship. Born into such a world, growing up in such an environment, why should they respect any thing or any body? They do not. And the family disintegrates as soon as

the children are old enough to declare their independence. Society has deprived the family of the means of securing normal living conditions for its future citizens. It is now confronted by the immediate and urgent problem of providing those conditions outside the family. The domestic home having been destroyed, a social one must be provided.

Such is the state of home and the family in the industrial centers. In the agricultural districts the condition is the same to a degree. There also, the production interests have largely gone out of the home. The family is no longer united by its common experience. The city streets and cheap shows are not present to take the place of the once-crowded domestic experience. The factory and shop are not there to provide employment for all the family; so, one by one, they take the road to the city in search of work, of diversion, of experience, of life. So much the worse for them if the life they find is not a normal and wholesome one.

We saw the universities established at the end of the middle ages, the grammar schools, in the middle of the sixteenth century, and at the beginning of the nineteenth, elementary public schools were at last established; but girls were not admitted to them until after the lapse of some time, and after a determined struggle had been made. The ideal of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" did not apply to women.

The education imparted in the public schools, formed under the influence of theological and aristocratic thought, and at a time when political control and not industrial administration was the end sought, has proved to be unsuited to the present needs of society. It is in no way related to industrial life, and industrial life is the basis of society. It seeks to train the mind to ideals which are outgrown and it does not equip the student for the business of making a living. And one must make a living before one can live. The home has ceased to train for industrial life; it has no means of doing so. But the public school does not fill the place thus left vacant. For this reason a revolution in education will necessarily follow the revolution in industry.

Women have now won their way into nearly all the institutions of learning of high and low degree; and they have there abundantly proven their ability to perform every sort of intellectual labor; they have made themselves at home in every sort of situation which requires intelligence, reliability, and general good character. But, strange anomaly as it is, the ancient institution of the Perpetual Tutelage of Women, which we noted in the earliest period of Roman history, at the time when Rome was a collection of mud huts, is still in operation in the condition of the married woman. But there is now hope that society will shortly throw off this yoke of barbarism, in the fact that women have at last

begun to organize. The idea of their first organizations, some forty years ago, was self-culture; their present ideal is social service, but it can not be long before they will embrace the purpose of self-deliverance. And when they do, they will also deliver society from an incubus which is probably the greatest impediment to personal happiness that the world has ever seen.

It has been found that, in a political democracy, the class that are conscious of their interests, the class who have large property interests at stake, who are experienced in organization and the control of affairs, control the votes of the workers, by the methods of befogging the issues, by corrupting both the legislative and the judiciary powers. Political democracy proves to be a system of controlling people, for the personal interest of a small class, in order that this class may make profits from the labor of the people. It is only feasible so long as the people remain ignorant of the way the system operates; for, though the people can not correct the evils of the system so long as it is in operation, they can, with their votes, change the system, as soon as the industrial foundation of life is ready for the change, and the majority of the people understand the situation.

The political revolution in Germany and France, in 1848, gave birth to a new development in thought, which, accompanying the industrial revolution, has been preparing the way for another po-

litical revolution. When modes of life change, the laws must, in time, change correspondingly. And a development in thought which enables society to understand the change as it progresses, will, of course, facilitate the change. But if, in addition to an intelligent understanding of the transformation, society can rise to the task of directing it into channels chosen on the basis of scientific knowledge, then we may, indeed, look for the Golden Age.

Sir Thomas More spoke truly when he said that society is a conspiracy of the rich against the poor, which conspiracy is carried out under the forms of law. But when a knowledge of social science shall have become general, and society shall undertake the conscious task of directing its own development, the conspiracy of the rich against the poor, of the strong against the weak, will change into a conspiracy of all mankind against nature, for the purpose of producing out of the natural elements the largest amount of material wealth, for the satisfaction of the needs of man. Along with this will go a simplifying of processes, a straightening of crooked paths, and a giving up of personal control, together with a higher order of economic administration. The watchword of the political philosophers of the eighteenth century was "freedom, equality, fraternity." "Social efficiency and personal happiness" is that of the social economists of the twentieth century.

The formulation of the Economic Interpretation of History is the great distinctive development of thought which can be dated from the middle of the nineteenth century. By the beginning of the twentieth century this principle had been pretty well comprehended and adopted by the teachers in the institutions of learning. This theory, and that of evolution, in physical science, have followed in the trail of the industrial revolution and are now preparing the way of another political revolution. And now, for the first time, society is becoming conscious of its own growth and striving to direct it. In the year 1913, even the politicians of all political parties are adopting the new theories to some extent, and making them the justification of their bid for support.

The direction in which the development of industrial processes is carrying us, is toward greater integration and co-ordination. Competition has been found too wasteful and destructive, and co-operation is taking its place.

The main part of the machinery of the coming social state, will be in the nature of industrial organization and administration. Political theories are constantly losing weight, and economic organization is continually gaining ground in social importance. A considerable portion of this administrative machinery is a new growth in society; and is now being set up for the first time by the working class. It consists in methods of collective

bargaining, and the control of working conditions by the workers. The weak and the poor are now doing some conspiring on their own account, and the rich and the strong are learning that they have them to reckon with. It is a wholesome lesson, and as it proceeds, fair and square dealing will become more and more necessary until the strong, not being able to take advantage of the weak any longer, and finding no profit any longer in the conspiracy, will be glad to give it up and make such terms as they can.

Since the change from common ownership to private control of the means of production, there has never been a real revolution. The bloody encounters that have occurred from time to time, have only resulted, at most, in some slight readjustments in the system. The conspiracy for the control of the means of subsistence has gone on afterward, as before. But the revolution which is now approaching will probably not be a bloody encounter at all. The workers of the world will build up their administrative machinery, by constantly enlarging the area of their activities. They will use their ballots to place their own people in control of their own machinery.

The scientist, the artist, the teacher, the inventor, will all line up with the workers, for the creation of a social order in which every kind of product, whether of hand or brain, will receive its just compensation, and in which every human being will have

an opportunity to live his own life and pursue his own happiness, in peace and plenty.

The great purpose of the absolute monarchies was to extend their territorial boundaries; the great purpose of constitutional monarchies is to extend their commercial relations and control the world markets. The armies of both types of governments are used for the selfish purposes of the ruling class, and the men are induced to fight, by an appeal to their "patriotism." Under a political democracy there is no theoretical justification for an army, excepting for purposes of defense; but as capital is transferred from commercial to industrial investments, and as the exploitation of the workers becomes ever more intense, strikes follow which the employers are not personally able to quell, and the army or militia of the state is used against the working class of the state, in the private interest of the employers. In case of strikes it is marched to the scene, and its guns are trained against the workers. The appeal to patriotism is still used, however, to induce the working men in the army to shoot the working men on strike.

In the meantime, the workers are being forced into solidarity by the conditions of their work. We saw that in the medieval towns, the craft guilds were powerless to better the condition of the workers until they all joined in one big organization, for the interests of their class. Then they gained political power in the towns. Craft unions of the

same type were in existence the world over at the time when the industrial revolution set in. But they were no longer organized in big bodies for political purposes, because the towns had been absorbed by the state, and the political relations of the individual were with the state. So there were unions of the old craft type, in every industrial country. But, as the machine is perfected, it takes over the job of the skilled artisan, and all there is left for him to do is to pull a lever or press a button; and by this process the separate craft lines are obliterated and all workmen are leveled down to the plane of operatives. Thus the aristocracy of skill disappears from the world of labor. Physical strength is no longer an element, a woman can pull a lever or press a button as well as a man, and the aristocracy of sex disappears. A black, brown, or yellow man is as good an adjunct to a machine as a white man, and the aristocracy of color vanishes. Race, creed, all are of no account to the working class. Instead of maintaining innumerable craft unions, the logical thing has now come to be for all to belong to one big union. The logic of the situation is now producing its results; craft unions are disintegrating and the union on the large lines of related industries is growing up. When all the operatives in an industry go on strike, the employers will naturally be brought to terms much more quickly than they will if only those skilled craftsmen who are still in some way related to the industry, go

on strike. If a strike of operatives in one city calls out the operatives in all other cities, so that the sources of supply for trade are stopped, so much the better. When, added to this, international boundaries are obliterated, the workers will be in a position to dictate terms to their exploiters. They will also be in a position to take over the control and operation of the industries, for their own purposes.

Consolidation of capital and management has gone so far on the part of the owners of the machines, that they have been able not only to keep wages down in the face of rising prices, but have been able to raise prices to such an extent that a general feeling of alarm has spread throughout the country, lest an uprising of the underpaid operatives will follow. Annual dividends soaring into the hundreds per cent. have become common, and a general campaign of "trust-busting" by the government has set in. But at the beginning of 1913, though a number of trusts have been "busted," in no case had the price of the product been reduced.

The control of money and credit has gone so far that a congressional committee is now conducting an investigation into the same. And J. Pierpont Morgan has gravely testified as a witness before this committee that credit can be cornered, and that at the present time, no man can borrow capital in this country unless the "character" of that man suits those in control, of whom he is the head.

Mr. Morgan's basis of estimating "character" is not revealed. It is now proposed that congress shall pass laws which will "bust" this combination in control of credit; but the results of the effort to prevent the monopolizing of commodities do not afford a basis of much hope that the effort will be successful.

The consolidation of labor is progressing rapidly, but is not yet abreast of that of capital. Yet the conflict is becoming so sharp that employers all along the line are beginning to make concessions on minor points. Moreover, within the last few years, the principles of evolutionary science have been applied to the field of psychology and sociology, as they never were before, and the result has been a revolution in that field also. So that it is now understood, by at least the most intelligent, that egotistic exploitation is not only antisocial, but is destructive of personal welfare, even of those who get the profits; not as a matter of sentiment, but as a matter of hard fact. In this way, the scientist is joining forces with the industrial union in recommending a course of moderation to the exploiters of labor. The cost of this moderation, however, will not nearly absorb the profits which will accrue from the constant increase in efficiency, so that, while the condition of the workers will improve, and they will become better able to maintain the class struggle, there will be an ever wider gulf between them and their employers. And as the work-

ers can never cease to struggle so long as any part of the reward of their labor is taken from them, the result must necessarily be a revolution, by which the machinery of production will pass into the collective possession of the workers, and the industries will, thereafter, be carried on for the purpose of satisfying human needs, and not for the private profit of any persons. Hours of work will then be reduced so that every one will have his share and a means of earning a living. Then every one will have time to read, to play, to travel, to dream and invite his soul. Consumption will be vastly increased, transportation will be developed, and the congested populations of the cities can spread out over the land. Every artist, poet and genius will have a chance to develop, and the country will be dotted over with art galleries, libraries, concert and lecture halls. Grand opera will be for every one, the cheap and the tawdry will disappear, since no one will need to make money out of perversions and depravities. Parks and pleasure grounds will take the place of slums, and social centers will be provided, where a happy and healthy people can come together for the delights of refined and inspiring human intercourse. This will be the Revolution.

THE END

PURITANISM

What is the economic basis for the demand, which we see occasionally cropping out even now, to limit the length of a girl's bathing suit by law?

Perhaps you have never thought of it, but the pious horror of a short bathing suit is closely related to early rising, political reform, Sunday baseball games, religous revivals, the "double standard of morality," the nude in art, woman suffrage, and the consumption of

MINCE PIE

If such a statement seems to you far-fetched, then you will derive instruction as well as enjoyment from a close reading of Clarence Meily's new book, "Puritanism," which is just off the press.

This little book will enable the American people, and the British as well, to understand themselves as they never have before, because we have inherited a large share of our ideas from our Puritan ancestors. It presents a fascinating study in that theory which has done so much to make clear to Socialists the meaning of life—the theory, nay, the fact, that the way people make their living largely determines their notions of what is right and moral and proper. No American should fail to read this book. It will enable him to understand the history of this country better than a library full of ordinary text books. It will clean out of his brain any remaining infection left there by past teachings and will enable him to see clearly through problems out of which our capitalist-minded lawmakers, preachers, professors, and editors are making a mess. A reading of this book will forever prevent any Socialist legislator from meddling with middle class "moral reforms." Attractively bound in cloth and well printed. Price, 50 cents postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,
118 West Kinzie St., Chicago.

SOCIALIST BOOKS

Published Co-operatively, Not for Profit
But for Propaganda

Allman's God's Children	$0.50
Andresen's The Republic	1.00
Baker's The Rose Door	1.00
Beals' The Rebel at Large	.50
Bebel's Woman and Socialism	1.50
Blatchford's Britain for the British	.50
Blatchford's God and My Neighbor	1.00
Boelsche's The Evolution of Man	.50
Boelsche's The Triumph of Life	.50
Boudin's Theoretical System of Marx	1.00
Brenholtz's The Recording Angel	1.00
Burrowes' Revolutionary Essays	1.00
Carpenter's Love's Coming of Age	1.00
Cohen's Socialism for Students	.50
Debs' Life, Writings and Speeches	1.00
Dietzgen's Philosophical Essays	1.00
Dietzgen's Positive Outcome of Philosophy	1.00
Engels' Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.	.50
Engels' Feuerbach	.50
Engels' Landmarks of Scientific Socialism.	1.00
Engels' Origin of the Family	.50

SOCIALIST BOOKS

Ferri's The Positive School of Criminology ..... .50
Ferri's Socialism and Modern Science.... 1.00
Fitch's Physical Basis of Mind and Morals 1.00
France's Germs of Mind in Plants..... .50
Franklin's The Socialization of Humanity. 2.00
Gladys' Thoughts of a Fool..... 1.00
Hitchcock's The Socialist Argument..... 1.00
Hightower's Happy Hunting Grounds.... 1.00
Hitch's Goethe's Faust ..... .50
Kautsky's The Class Struggle..... .50
Kautsky's The Social Revolution..... .50
Kautsky's Ethics and Materialist Conception of History ..... .50
Labriola's Materialistic Conception of History $1.00
Labriola's Socialism and Philosophy..... 1.00
Lafargue's The Evolution of Property... .50
Lafargue's The Right to Be Lazy and Other Studies ..... .50
Lafargue's Social and Philosophical Studies ..... .50
La Monte's Socialism, Positive and Negative ..... .50
Lewis' (Arthur M.) An Introduction to Sociology 1.00
Lewis' (Arthur M.) The Art of Lecturing .50
Lewis' (Arthur M.) Evolution, Social and Organic ..... .50
Lewis' (Arthur M.) Marx vs. Tolstoy (Darrow Debate) ..... .50
Lewis' (Arthur M.) Ten Blind Leaders.. .50
Lewis' (Arthur M.) Vital Problems in Social Evolution ..... .50
Lewis' (Austin) Rise of the American Proletarian 1.00
Lewis' (Austin) The Militant Proletariat. .50
Liebknecht's Memoirs of Karl Marx..... .50
Marcy's Out of the Dump..... .50

SOCIALIST BOOKS

Marx's Capital, Vol. I	2.00
Marx's Capital, Vol. II	2.00
Marx's Capital, Vol. III	2.00
Marx's Critique of Political Economy	1.00
Marx's The Poverty of Philosophy	1.00
Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte	.50
Marx's Revolution and Counter-Revolution	.50
Marx's Value, Price and Profit	.50
Marx and Engels' The Communist Manifesto	.50
Maynard's Walt Whitman	1.00
Meily's Puritanism	.50
Meyer's The End of the World	$0.50
Meyer's The Making of the World	.50
Morris and Bax's Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome	.50
Morgan's Ancient Society	1.50
Myers' Great American Fortunes, Vol. I	1.50
Myers' Great American Fortunes, Vol. II	1.50
Myers' Great American Fortunes, Vol. III	1.50
Myers' History of the Supreme Court	2.00
Nietzsche's Human, All Too Human	.50
Parce's Economic Determinism	1.00
Plechanoff's Socialism and Anarchism	.50
Plummer's Gracia, A Social Tragedy	1.00
Pollock's The Russian Bastile	.50
Pouget's Sabotage	.50
Rappaport's Looking Forward	1.00
Raymond's Rebels of the New South	1.00
Richardson's Industrial Problems	1.00
Russell's Stories of the Great Railroads	1.00
Simons' The American Farmer	.50
Simons' Class Struggles in America	.50
Sinclair's Prince Hagen	1.00
Spargo's Capitalist and Laborer	.50
Spargo's Common Sense of Socialism	1.00
Spargo's The Marx He Knew	.50
Steere's When Things Were Doing	1.00

SOCIALIST BOOKS

Teichmann's Life and Death	.50
Triggs' The Changing Order	1.00
Turner's Barbarous Mexico	1.50
Untermann's The World's Revolutions	.50
Untermann's Marxian Economics	1.00
Untermann's Science and Revolution	.50
Vail's Modern Socialism	.75
Vail's Principles of Scientific Socialism	1.00
Ward's The Ancient Lowly, Vol. I	2.00
Ward's The Ancient Lowly, Vol. II	2.00
Winchevsky's Stories of the Struggle	$0.50
Wooldridge's Perfecting the Earth	1.00
Work's What's So and What Isn't	.50

Any of these books will be mailed to any address promptly on receipt of price. All of them are substantially bound in cloth.

The International Socialist Review, an illustrated monthly magazine, is the one periodical which is positively indispensable to any reader desiring to keep informed regarding the Revolutionary Socialist movement of the United States and Europe. One dollar a year; 50c for 6 months; 25c for 3 months.

A descriptive catalogue of our books, with an explanation of our co-operative plan for circulating Socialist literature, will be mailed free on request.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,

Publishers,

118 West Kinzie Street, Chicago.

Augsburg College
George Sverdrup Library
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404

HC
25
P3

HC
25
P3
Parce
96976
Economic determinism

HC
25
P3
96976

O8-CRI-533